first 3 vols 22/6 ae

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

https://archive.org/details/journaloftheolog01unse

F 15
35

J Picton-Warlow.

8/3/07

The

Journal of Theological Studies

VOLUME I

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

VOLUME I

Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1900

v. 1

1899/1900

COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION:

Rev. Dr. Ince, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.
Rev. Dr. Swete, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.
Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr. Lock, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.
Rev. Dr. Moberly, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford.
Rev. Dr. Robertson, Principal of King's College, London; late Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham.
Rev. Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, Canon of Westminster; late Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr. Ryle, Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr. Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.
Rev. Dr. Stanton, Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

EDITOR:

C. H. Turner, Magdalen College, Oxford.

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

W. Emery Barnes, D.D., Peterhouse, Cambridge.

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

I

INDEX OF WRITERS

PAGE

BARNARD, Rev. P. Mordaunt.
  Koetschau's Edition of Origen 455

BARNES, Rev. W. Emery, D.D.
  Old Testament Chronicle 144, 470
  Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (Tiḳḳun Ṣopherim) 387
  A Fresh Interpretation of Isaiah xxi 1–10 583

BATE, Rev. H. N.
  New Testament Chronicle (English Works) 309

BEVAN, Prof. A. A.
  Schechter and Taylor's Wisdom of Ben-Sira . . . 135

BRIDGES, Robert.
  A Practical Discourse on some Principles of Hymn-singing 40

BRIGHTMAN, Rev. F. E.
  The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis . . . 88, 247
  The Italian Origin of Codex Bezae: the Marginal Notes of Lections 446
  Chronicle of Liturgica 630

BROOKS, E. W.
  A German Translation (Ahrens and Krüger) of the Church History of Zacharias Rhetor 620

BURKITT, F. C.
  The Vulgate Gospels (Wordsworth and White) 129
  St. Mark xv 34 in *k* (Codex Bobiensis) 278
  The Baptismal Rite in the Canons of Hippolytus . 279
  The Original Language of the Acts of Judas Thomas 280
  Isaiah xix 18 568
  St. Ephraim's Quotation of Matt. xxi 3 569
  Chronicle of New Testament Criticism 624

BURN, Rev. A. E., B.D.
  Eusebius of Vercelli 592

BUTLER, Dom.
  Chronicle of Hagiographica 628

PAGE

CAIRD, E., Master of Balliol.
  ANSELM'S ARGUMENT FOR THE BEING OF GOD 23

CROSS, Rev. J. A.
  THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: A CRITICISM OF LIGHTFOOT AND HEADLAM 64

CRUM, W. E. (and KENYON, F. G.)
  TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. JOHN IN GREEK AND MIDDLE EGYPTIAN 415

DOWDEN, Rt. Rev. J., D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh.
  'OUR ALMS AND OBLATIONS': AN HISTORICAL STUDY . 321
  CATALOGUE OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE NON-JURING BISHOPS AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES (1716–1725) 562

FRERE, Rev. W. H.
  EDWARDINE VERNACULAR SERVICES BEFORE THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK 229

GRAY, Rev. G. BUCHANAN.
  THE NAZIRITE 201

GWATKIN, Rev. Professor H. M.
  DILL'S ROMAN SOCIETY IN THE LAST CENTURY OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE 600

HAVERFIELD, F.
  THE *Strategoi* OF PHILIPPI 434

KENYON, F. G.
  THE PHOTOGRAPHIC EDITION OF CODEX BEZAE 293
  (and CRUM, W. E.)
  TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. JOHN IN GREEK AND MIDDLE EGYPTIAN 415

LAKE, Rev. K.
  SOME NEW MEMBERS OF THE FERRAR GROUP OF MSS OF THE GOSPELS 117
  THE TEXT OF CODEX Ψ IN ST. MARK 290
  THE ITALIAN ORIGIN OF CODEX BEZAE: THE EVIDENCE OF COD. 1071 441

MACDONELL, Prof. A. A.
  THE ANCIENT INDIAN CONCEPTION OF THE SOUL AND ITS FUTURE STATE 492

OMAN, C.
  HODGKIN ON LOMBARDS, POPES, AND FRANKS 603

PLUMMER, Rev. A., D.D.
  DR. SWETE'S ST. MARK 613

RACKHAM, Rev. R. B.
  THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: A PLEA FOR AN EARLY DATE 76

PAGE

RAMSAY, Prof. W. M.
 THE TITLE OF THE MAGISTRATES AT PHILIPPI 114
 THE GREEK FORM OF THE NAME PHILIPPIANS 116

ROBERTSON, Rev. A., D.D.
 DR. HORT ON I PETER 299

RUSHFORTH, G. McN.
 CHRONICLE OF ARCHAEOLOGICA 304

SANDAY, Rev. W., D.D.
 RECENT RESEARCH ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CREED . . . 3
 A NEW WORK ON THE PARABLES 161
 ST. PAUL'S EQUIVALENT FOR THE 'KINGDOM OF HEAVEN' 481

SOLLERTINSKY, Rev. Prof. S.
 THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST (translated from the Russian) 507

STRONG, Rev. T. B., B.D.
 DR. HORT'S LIFE AND WORKS 370

SWETE, Rev. H. B., D.D.
 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT 1

TAYLOR, Rev. C., D.D., Master of St. John's.
 THE WISDOM OF BEN-SIRA 571

TENNANT, Rev. F. R.
 THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TENDENCIES IN NATURAL PHILOSOPHY 347

TURNER, C. H.
 ON πλήρης IN ST. JOHN I 14 . . . . 120, 561
 GELASIUS OF CYZICUS 125
 EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLI 126
 CHRONICLE OF PATRISTICA 148
 THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS:
  1 THE CHRONICLE OF EUSEBIUS . . . 181
  2 THE LIST OF JERUSALEM 529
 CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF LATIN MSS: THE MSS OF COUNCILS IN THE LIBRARY OF THE COLLEGE OF CLERMONT 435
 LATIN LISTS OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS: THE ROMAN COUNCIL UNDER DAMASUS, A.D. 382 554

VALENTINE-RICHARDS, A. V.
 HILGENFELD'S EDITION OF THE ACTS 606

WAGGETT, Rev. P. N.
 CHURCH AFFAIRS IN SOUTH AFRICA 212

WEBB, C. C. J.
 TWO BOOKS ON MYSTICISM (Inge, *Bampton Lectures*: Bigg, *Unity in Diversity*) 461

II

INDEX OF ARTICLES

PAGE

Acts of the Apostles, The. I. A Criticism of Lightfoot and Headlam. By the Rev. J. A. Cross 64

Acts of the Apostles, The. II. A Plea for an Early Date. By the Rev. R. B. Rackham 76

Africa, Church Affairs in South. By the Rev. P. N. Waggett, S.S.J.E. 212

'Alms and Oblations, Our': An Historical Study. By the Right Rev. J. Dowden, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh . . . 321

Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (*Tikḳun Ṣopherim*). By the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D. . . 387

Anselm's Argument for the Being of God. By E. Caird, Master of Balliol 23

CHRONICLE:

- Archaeologica. G. M^cN. Rushforth 304
- Hagiographica. Dom Butler 628
- Liturgica. F. E. B. 630
- New Testament Criticism. F. C. B. 624
- New Testament: English Works. Rev. H. N. Bate . . 309
- Old Testament. W. E. B. (A. A. B., F. C. B.) 144
- Old Testament. W. E. B. 470
- Patristica. C. H. T. 148

Creed, Recent Research on the Origin of the. By the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. 3

DOCUMENTS:

- Latin Lists of the Canonical Books. I. The Roman Council under Damasus, a.d. 382. By C. H. Turner . 554
- Serapion of Thmuis, The Sacramentary of. By the Rev. F. E. Brightman. Part I 88
  - Part II 247
- Two Chapters of St. John in Greek and Middle Egyptian. By W. E. Crum and F. G. Kenyon 415

PAGE

Edwardine Vernacular Services before the First Prayer Book. By the Rev. W. H. Frere 229

Episcopal Lists, The Early. By C. H. Turner. I. The Chronicle of Eusebius 181

II. The Jerusalem List 529

Hort, Life and Works of Dr. By the Rev. T. B. Strong, B.D. 370

Hymn-singing, A Practical Discourse on some Principles of. By Robert Bridges 40

Indian Conception of the Soul and its Future State, The Ancient. By Prof. A. A. Macdonell 492

Introductory Statement. By H. B. S. 1

John the Baptist, The Death of St. From the Russian of Prof. S. Sollertinsky 507

'Kingdom of Heaven,' St. Paul's Equivalent for the. By the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. 481

Natural Philosophy, The Theological Significance of Tendencies in. By the Rev. F. R. Tennant 347

Nazirite, The. By the Rev. G. Buchanan Gray 201

NOTES:

A fresh Interpretation of Isaiah xxi 1–10. By the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D. 583

Chapters in the History of Latin MSS. By C. H. Turner 435

On Eusebius of Vercelli. By C. H. Turner 126

By the Rev. A. E. Burn, B.D. . 592

On Gelasius of Cyzicus. By C. H. Turner 125

On Isaiah xix 18: On St. Ephraim's Quotation of Matt. xxi 3. By F. C. Burkitt 568

On πλήρης in St. John i 14. By C. H. Turner . . 120, 561

On St. Mark xv 34 in Cod. *k*: On the Baptismal Rite in the Canons of Hippolytus: The Original Language of the Acts of Judas Thomas. By F. C. Burkitt . . 278

On the Correspondence between the Nonjuring Bishops and the Eastern Churches (1716–1725). By the Right Rev. J. Dowden, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh 562

On the Greek Form of the Name Philippians. By Prof. W. M. Ramsay 116

On the Italian Origin of Codex Bezae: 1. Codex Bezae and Codex 1071. By the Rev. K. Lake. 2. The Marginal Notes of Lections. By the Rev. F. E. Brightman 441

PAGE

NOTES (*continued*):

On the ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙ of Philippi. By Prof. W. M. Ramsay . 114
By F. Haverfield . . 434
On the Text of Codex Ψ in St. Mark. By the Rev. K. Lake 290
Some new Members of the Ferrar Group of MSS of the Gospels. By the Rev. K. Lake 117
The Wisdom of Ben Sira. By the Rev. C. Taylor, D.D., Master of St. John's 571

Parables, A New Work on the. By the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. 161

Recent Periodicals relating to Theological Studies . . 157, 317, 477, 636

REVIEWS:

K. Ahrens and G. Krüger. *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, in deutscher Uebersetzung.* By E. W. Brooks 620
Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis sumptibus Academiae phototypice repraesentatus. By F. G. Kenyon 293
S. Dill. *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire.* By the Rev. Prof. Gwatkin 600
A. Hilgenfeld. *Acta Apostolorum Graece et Latine secundum antiquissimos testes edidit, Actus Apostolorum extra canonem receptum et adnotationes ad textum et argumentum Actuum Apostolorum addidit.* By A. V. Valentine-Richards . . 606
T. Hodgkin. *Italy and her Invaders*, vols. vii and viii. By C. Oman 603
F. J. A. Hort. *The First Epistle of St. Peter* i 1—ii 17; *the Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes.* By the Rev. A. Robertson, D.D. . . 299
W. R. Inge. *Christian Mysticism, the Bampton Lectures for* 1899: and C. Bigg. *Unity in Diversity, five addresses.* By C. C. J. Webb 461
P. Koetschau. *Origenes' Werke: Band* 1, *die Schrift vom Martyrium, Buch I–IV gegen Celsus; Band* 2, *Buch V–VIII gegen Celsus, die Schrift vom Gebet:* By the Rev. P. Mordaunt Barnard 455
S. Schechter and C. Taylor. *Portions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus.* By Prof. A. A. Bevan 135
H. B. Swete. *The Gospel according to St. Mark, the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices.* By the Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. 613
J. Wordsworth and H. J. White. *Nouum Testamentum latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi*, vol. i. By F. C. Burkitt . 129

III

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS REVIEWED, NOTICED, OR DISCUSSED

PAGE

Abbott. (*See* Ferrar and Abbott.)

Abrahams, I. (and Cook, S. A.) *Dress* [in Encyclopaedia Biblica I] . . 471

Achelis, H. *Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert* . . . 629

Adler, E. N. On Ecclesiasticus [Jewish Quarterly Review, April 1900] . 571

Adler, M. *Hebrew Grammar with Exercises*, 1900 476

Ahrens, K. (and Krüger, G). *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, in deutscher Uebersetzung* 620

Atchley, C. On ceremonial use of lights in 1548 [in J. W. Legg's *Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book*, 1899] 635

Ayles, H. H. B. *Destination, Date, and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* 315

Bacher, W. *Notes on the Cambridge Fragments of Ecclesiasticus* [Jewish Quarterly Review, January 1900] 575

Ball, C. J. *Light from the East, or the Witness of the Monuments* . . 146

Barnard, P. M. *Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria* [Texts and Studies V 5] 626

Barrett, Dom. *Early Scottish Saints* [Dublin Review] 629

Baudissin, Wolf. *Gad* [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyclopädie VI] . . 145

Beer, G. On Meinhold's *Die Jesajaerzählungen* [Theologische Literaturzeitung, Feb. 3, 1900] 474

Benzinger, I. *Die Bücher der Könige*, 1899 [Kurzer Hand-Commentar] . 145

Bernard, J. H. *The Pastoral Epistles* [Cambridge Greek Testament] . 315

Bertholet, A. *Hesekiel*, 1897 [Kurzer Hand-Commentar] 145

Beza. *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis . . . phototypice repraesentatus* . . 293

Bidez, J. (and Parmentier, L.). *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia* [Byzantine Texts, ed. Bury] 156

Bigg, C. *Unity in Diversity* 468

Bishop, E. *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, 1899 : *Kyrie Eleison, a Liturgical Consultation*, 1900 632
    See also Gasquet and Bishop.

Blass, F. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* 121, 561

Bollandists. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1899 ; *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Vaticanae ; Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, II, III 628, 629

Bonnet, M. *Acta Thomae*, 1883 . . . . 280 ff, 561
    The Acts of Apollonios [Analecta Bollandiana, 1899] 628

Bonwetsch, N. *Gregor der Wunderthäter* [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyclopädie] 630

Bourban. Excavations at St. Maurice [Nuovo bull. di archeologia cristiana, 1898, 1899] 307

Braun, O. Bishop Maruta *de Nicaena synodo* [Kirchengeschichtliche Studien IV 3, ed. Knöpfler, Schrörs, and Sdralek] 152

Brinkmann. On πλήρης indeclinable [Rheinisches Museum (1899), LIV 94] 561

PAGE

Budde, K. *Canon of the Old Testament* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] 470
  Religious Life and Thought among the Hebrews in Pre-exilic days 474
Burn, A. E. *Introduction to the Creeds* 127
Burney, C. F. *I and II Kings* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] 145
Cagin, Dom. *Le Sacramentarium Triplex de Gerbert* [Revue des Bibliothèques, 1899; also printed separately] 631
Campbell, C. *The First Three Gospels in Greek* [a synopsis], ed. 2 316
Caspari. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols* 8
Cheyne, T. K. *Abraham, Adam and Eve, Babel* (*Tower of*), *Cherub, Creation, Deluge* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] 470, 471
  Introduction to Isaiah 583 ff
Comper, J. N. The English Gothic sanctuary [in J. W. Legg's *Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book*, 1899] 635
Cook, S. A. (*See* Abrahams, I.)
Cooke, G. A. *Haggai* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] 144
Cornill. *History of the People of Israel* 474
  Prophets of Israel, ed. 4 474
Corssen, P. Two new fragments of the Codex Weingartensis of the Prophets 146
  Bericht über die lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen [Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, 1899 (II); also printed separately] 627
Cronin, H. S. *Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus* [Texts and Studies V 4] 625
Crostarosa, Mgr. The Mosaic in Sta. Pudenziana: The stamps on the roof-tiles of Sta. Maria Maggiore and San Martino ai Monti [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1895–1897] 304, 305
Czapla, B. *Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker* [Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, IV 1] 151
Dalman, G. *Hades* [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyclopädie^3 VII] 470
  Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch 475, 624
  Worte Jesu, 1898 624
Davidson, A. B. *God* (*in O. T.*), *Hosea, Jeremiah* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] 144
Davison, W. T. *Job* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] 145
Dewick. *The Coronation Book of Charles V of France* [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1899] 632
Dictionary of the Bible. (*See* Hastings, J.)
Diettrich. *Einige grammatische Beobachtungen z. drei im British Museum befindl. jemenit. Handschriften des Onqelostargums* [Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1900] 475
Dill, S. *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* 600
Dillmann. *Jesaja*, ed. 5 583
  ed. 6 (1898: edited by R. Kittel) 145
Dmitrijewskij, A. Sacramentary of Serapion [in *Trudy*, the Journal of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Kiew, 1894: also printed separately] 276
Dombart, B. *S. Augustini de Ciuitate Dei*, ed. 1, 1863, ed. 2, 1877 151
Dowden, Rt. Rev. J. *Workmanship of the Prayer Book* 634
Drews. Sacramentary of Serapion [Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1899] 277
Driver, S. R. *Habakkuk, Jacob, Joseph* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] 144
  Hebrew Authority [in Hogarth's Authority and Archaeology, 1899] 145
  Isaiah, ed. 2 583
  (and Robertson Smith, W.) *Chronicles* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] 470
Duchesne, L. *Le Forum Chrétien*, 1899 308
  Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule 552, 629

PAGE

Duhm, B. *Die Psalmen*, 1899 145
  Jesaja, 1892 . . . . 145, 583 ff
von Dzialowski, G. *Isidor und Ildefons als Litterarhistoriker* [Kirchengeschichtliche Studien IV 2] 151
Encyclopaedia Biblica, ed. T. K. Cheyne, I 309, 470
Ferrar (and Abbott). The Ferrar group of MSS of the Gospels, 1877 . 117
Ficker, G. *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus*, 1897 . . . . . 593, 599
Field, F. *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, 1899 . . . 312
Franchi. *S. Agnese nella tradizione e nella legenda* [Herder's Römische Quartalschrift] 629
Frere, W. H. Text and illustrations of the *Exposition de la Messe* [Alcuin Club, 1899] 633
von Gall. *Altisraelitische Kultstätten* 475
Gasquet, Dom (and Bishop, E.) *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* 229 ff
Geyer, P. *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi iiii-viii* [Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. XXXIX] 148
Giovenale. Sta. Cecilia in Trastevere [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1897] 306
Godet. *Introduction to the New Testament: Gospel Collection and St. Matthew* 315
Goetz, K. G. *Der alte Anfang und die ursprüngliche Form von Cyprian's Schrift ad Donatum* [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, IV 1] 153
von der Goltz. *Eine textkritische Arbeit des 10ten bezw. 6ten Jahrhunderts* [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, II 4] 626
Gregory, C. R. Catalogue of (Athos) MSS in Prolegomena to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* ed. 8 . . . . 290, 441, 443
Gressmann. On Littmann's *Tritojesaja* [Theologische Literaturzeitung, Feb. 17, 1900] 475
Grisar. *Una scuola classica di marmorarii medievali* [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1895] 304
Guthe, H. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* 473
von Gutschmid. *De temporum notis quibus Eusebius utitur* . . . 188 ff
Harnack, A. The Apostles' Creed [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie^3] . 11 ff
  Appendix to Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*, ed. 3 11
  Maruta's Catalogue of Heresies [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, IV 1] 153
  Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Irenäus, 1897 181 ff, 532 ff
Harris, J. Rendel. *The Origin of the Ferrar Group* . . . . . . 117 ff
  A Study of Codex Bezae [Texts and Studies II 1] . . . . . 446 ff
Hastings, J. (Editor of) *A Dictionary of the Bible* II . 64, 144, 309, 312
Hauck. (*See* Herzog.)
Haussleiter. *Zwanzig Predigten Novatians* [Theologisches Literaturblatt, April 6, 13, 20, 1900] 628
Hawkins, Sir J. C. *Horae Synopticae*, 1899 625
Headlam, A. C. *Acts of the Apostles* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible I] 64 ff
  Christian Authority [in Hogarth's Authority and Archaeology, 1899] 308
Herzog. *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. 3 by Hauck 11, 145, 470, 630
Hilgenfeld, A. *Acta Apostolorum graece et latine*, 1899 606
Hodgkin, T. *Italy and her Invaders*, vols. VII, VIII, 1899 603
Hoffmann. Emendations in the Syriac *Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor* 620 ff
Hoffmann, E. *S. Augustini de Ciuitate Dei* libb. i-xiii [Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat. vol. XL] 150
Hogarth, D. G. (Editor of) *Authority and Archaeology*, 1899 . . 145, 308
Hope, St. J. *English Altars from Illuminated MSS* [Alcuin Club, 1899] . 633

PAGE

HORT, F. J. A. *Two Dissertations* . . . 7, 13
  The First Epistle of St. Peter (i 1–ii 17) . . . 299
  The Way, The Truth, The Life . . . 376
  Introduction to the *New Testament in Greek* . . . 379
  On St. Mark iv 28 [in Appendix to Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*] . . . 121
  Judaistic Christianity . . . 380
  The Christian Ecclesia . . . 381, 385
HURGRONJE, C. S. On E. Sachau's *Muhammedanisches Recht nach schafiitischer Lehre* [Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft LIII 1] . . . 147
Hymnorum, Liber. [Henry Bradshaw Society] . . . 126, 595
INGE, W. R. *Christian Mysticism*, 1899 . . . 461
JACOB, B. *Zur Geschichte des Psalmentextes der Vulgata im* 16. *Jahrhundert* [Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1900] . . . 475
JEEP. *Zur Ueberlieferung des Philostorgios* [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, II 3] . . . 153
JENSEN, P. *Die Inschrift I von Jerabis* [Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft LIII 3] . . . 476
JÜLICHER, A. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 2 vols. (vol. 1 in 2nd ed.), 1899 . 161
KAMPHAUSEN, A. *Daniel* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] . . . 471
KATTENBUSCH, F. *Das apostolische Symbol* . . . 10 ff
KAUTZSCH. *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* . . 474
KING, L. W. *Assyria, Babylonia* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] . . . 470
  Babylonian Religion, 1899 . . . 474
KIRCHHOFF. *Vorlesungen über Math. Physik*, 1876 . . . 354 ff, 365 f
KITTEL, R. editor of 6th ed. of Dillmann's *Jesaja*, 1898 . . . 145, 584 f
  I, II Kings [Nowack's Handkommentar zum A.T.] . . . 471
KOENIG, E. *Jonah* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] . . . 145
  Die Originalität des hebräischen Sirachtextes . . . 473
KOETSCHAU, P. *Origenes' Werke I, II* [*de martyrio, contra Celsum, de oratione*] 1899 . . . 455
DE KOKOWZOFF, P. *Nouvel essai d'interprétation de la seconde Inscription Araméenne de Nirab* [Journal Asiatique (XIV 3) 1899] . . . 476
KRAETZSCHMAR, R. On Stade's *Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel* . . 474
KRÜGER, G. (*See* AHRENS, K.)
KUNZE. Marcus Eremita and the Creed, 1895 . . . 10, 19
LADEUZE. *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhomien* . . . 628
LEFORT. The mosaic of Sta. Pudenziana [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1896] . . . 305
LEGG, J. W. *The Processional of the Nuns of Chester* [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1899] . . . 632
  Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book historically considered, 1899 . . . 635
LÉVI, I. On Ecclesiasticus [Revue des Études Juives (XL 79) 1900] . 575 ff
LIDZBARSKI. *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, 1898 . . . 146
LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *Acts of the Apostles* [Smith's Dictionary of the Bible I ed. 2] . . . 64 ff
  S. Clement of Rome (ed. 2) . . . 183 ff, 193, 539
LIPPE. *The Missale Romanum of* 1474 [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1899] . 632
LIPSIUS, R. A. *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* . . . 281 ff
LITTMANN, E. *Ueber die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaja* . . . 475
LOCK, W. *St. Paul the Master Builder* . . . 316

PAGE

Loofs, F. Kattenbusch and the origin of the Creed [Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1895] . . . 10, 21
  Gregor von Nazianz, Gregor von Nyssa [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie] . . . 630
Mach. *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwickelung: Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen: Wärmelehre* . . . 356 ff
Magani, Mgr. *Antica liturgia romana*, 1897–99 . . . 630
Margoliouth, G. Two leaves of Ecclesiasticus [Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1899] . . . 472, 574
Martin, J. P. *Quatre manuscrits importants*, 1886 . . . 117 ff
Marucchi. The Abercius Inscription [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1895]: The Cathedral at Parenzo in Istria [*ib.* 1896]: Crypt of SS. Peter and Marcellinus [*ib.* 1898]: Tomb of the martyrs Marcus and Marcellianus [*ib.* 1899]: Inscription from the Basilicas on the Ardeatine Way [*ib.*]: A sixth-century plan of the Jerusalem Holy Places [*ib.*] . . . 304 ff
Maude, J. H. *History of the Book of Common Prayer* [Oxford Church Text Books] . . . 633
Meinhold. *Die Jesajaerzählungen* . . . 474
Miller, H. G. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* . . . 315
Monti. San Giovanni in Argentella [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1898] . . . 306
Morin, Dom. *L'Ambrosiaster et le juif converti Isaac* [Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, 1899] . . . 154
  Pseudo-Vigilius *de Trinitate* [Revue Bénédictine, January 1898] 128, 592 ff
  S. Cesarius of Arles [Revue Bénédictine, March &c., 1899] . . . 154
  The Canons of Hippolytus [Revue Bénédictine, July 1900] . . . 632
Moulton. *Ueber die Ueberlieferung und den textkritischen Werth des dritten Esrabuches* [Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 1900] . 475
Nestle, E. On πλήρης indeclinable [in Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch] . . . 561
Noeldeke. On the Syriac origin of the *Acta Thomae* [in Lipsius' Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten] . . . 281 ff
  Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Ben Sira [Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1900] . . . 475
  Emendations in the Syriac Church History of Zacharias Rhetor . 620
Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1895–1899 . . . 304
Parmentier, L. (*See* Bidez, J.)
Pearson, K. *Grammar of Science*, 1892 . . . 357, 366
Pères Blancs, un Missionnaire des. Lambaesis, Sicilibba, Theveste, Mascula [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1898, 1899] . . 307
Pohlmann, A. On the Roman edition of St. Ephraim, 1862–4 . . . 570
Pullan, L. *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1900 [Oxford Library of Practical Theology] . . . 634
Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Herzog-Hauck, ed. 3 . . . 11, 145, 470, 630
Ridgeway. *Amber, Beryl, Carbuncle, Diamond* [Encyclopaedia Biblica I] . . . 471
Rietschl. *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* I 1, 1899; I 2, 1900 . . . 630
Ryle, H. E. *Genesis* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] . . . 144
Sachau, E. (*See* Hurgronje, C. S.)
Savio. A spurious letter of St. Ambrose composed at Ravenna [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1897] . . . 305
  Gli antichi Vescovi d' Italia . . . 629

PAGE

Schechter, S. Two leaves of Ecclesiasticus [Jewish Quarterly Review, April 1900] 473, 575
(and Taylor, C.). *Portions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew MSS in the Cairo Genizah Collection* 135
Scrivener, F. H. A. Edition of *Codex Bezae* . . . . 446 ff
Smend. *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, ed. 2, 1899 . 146
Smendt, J. *Kelchspendung und Kelchversagung in der abendländischen Kirche*, 1898 631
Smith, G. A. *Isaiah* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] . . . 144
Smith, H. P. *Samuel*, 1899 [International Critical Commentary] . . 145
Stade. (*See* Kraetschmar, R.)
Stallo. *Concepts of Modern Physics* . . . . 364 ff
Stevenson. Catacomb of St. Cyriaca; Mosaic at Madaba in Palestine; Catacombs of Domitilla: Catalogue of Christian cemeteries (end of cent. 4); New excavations at the Basilica of St. Paul [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1895–1898] 305, 306
Swete, H. B. *The Gospel according to St. Mark: the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices* 613
Taylor, C. (*See* Schechter, S.)
Thiel, A. *De decretali Gelasii papae . . . et Damasi concilio Romano*, 1866 . 554 f
Tomassetti. On the cemetery *ad inphalatos* [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1899] 307
Toy. *Proverbs* [International Critical Commentary] 471
Tylor, T. (*See* Volz.)
Volz. On Tylor's *Ecclesiastes* [Theologische Literaturzeitung, Feb. 3, 1900] 475
Walther. *Gregor I* [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie] 630
Ward, J. *Gifford Lectures* . . . . 348 ff
Weir, T. H. *A Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament* . 146
Wendland, P. On Koetschau's edition of Origen [Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, April 1899] . . . . 455 ff
Westcott, B. F. *Canon of the New Testament* 554
(*See* also Hort, F. J. A.)
White, H. J. (*See* Wordsworth, J.)
Williams, G. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the eighteenth century, being the correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops*, 1868 . . . . 562 ff
Wilpert, Mgr. A fresco in the Catacomb of Domitilla [Nuovo bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1899] 307
Wobbermin, G. The Prayers of Serapion of Thmuis [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, II 3] . . . . . . 88 ff, 108 ff, 269 ff
Woods, F. H. *Flood, Hexateuch* [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible II] . 144
St. Ephraim's quotations from the Gospels [Studia Biblica III] . 569
Wordsworth, J., and White, H. J. *Nouum Testamentum latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi*, vol. I 129
Wright, W. Acts of St. Thomas in Syriac, 1871 . . . . . . 280 ff
Zahn, Th. *The Articles of the Apostles' Creed*, translated by A. E. Burn [*Expositor*, 1898; also printed separately] . . . . . . 8 ff
On Morin's Theory of the Ambrosiaster [Theologisches Literaturblatt, July 7, 1899] 156
Forschungen VI . . . . 535 ff
On the Damasine Decree [in his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II 1] 554
Zöckler. *Franz von Assisi* [Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie] . . 630

The Journal of Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1899

Non licet esse vos. Such is the greeting which we anticipate from a chorus of censors whose patience is exhausted by the steady growth of periodical literature. We venture to meet them with the old retort: *ideo negatis licere quia vultis, non quia debuit non licere.* While we strongly sympathize with the refusal to tolerate an unnecessary increase of this class of publications, we believe that in the case of our own venture we can establish a claim not only to appear but to live.

No English journal hitherto has devoted itself exclusively to the furtherance of theological learning. Theological contributions of great merit are scattered through the volumes of our leading ecclesiastical newspaper, and of periodicals which minister to the wants of the preacher and the exegete. The current literature of Theology is discussed in more than one useful quarterly. Papers illustrating Biblical archaeology or patristic literature have found hospitable shelter in the *Journal of Philology* and the *Classical Review*, and larger pieces of scholarly work appear from time to time in *Studia Biblica* and in *Texts and Studies.* We gratefully recognize the services which are thus rendered to theological research. But we still desiderate a regular organ of communication between students whose lives are spent, at the Universities and elsewhere, in the pursuit of scientific Theology.

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES is intended to supply this want. It will welcome original papers on all subjects which fall within its province, as well as shorter discussions or brief notes upon matters of detail. It will print ancient texts which have not appeared in type, or which for any cause may need to be printed afresh. A portion of its space will be given to summaries and notices of recent literature, and it will review at length a few of the more important works, in cases where a fuller examination may serve to contribute to the knowledge of the subject.

Such a periodical will appeal in the first instance to professed students and teachers of Theology. But its promoters will not lose sight of the requirements of the increasing class of educated Englishmen, to be found among the laity as well as among ministers of religion, who are profoundly interested in the problems raised by Biblical and other theological studies. With this wider circle of readers it will partly rest to determine whether we shall be permitted to continue our undertaking, and both from them and from theological experts we ask for a fair trial. We are content to be judged by the character of our work. *Id non debet licere quod male fit, et utique hoc ipso praeiudicatur licere quod bene fit.*

H. B. S.

RECENT RESEARCH ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CREED.

THE subject of this paper is 'Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed.' I speak of the 'Creed,' not the 'Creeds,' although I intend to include both the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, because it will be well known, and I may assume, that these are really varieties—marked and characteristic varieties—of the same fundamental creed. If we look not so much at the clothing or details of expression as at the skeleton or inner structure and substance of the two creeds, this fundamental identity will come out.

Of course we ought to compare, not the present 'received texts' of the two creeds, but the oldest and simplest forms of both. We ought to strip off the accretions which have come to them in the course of their history, and which sometimes impart to them a delusive external similarity, while at other times they obscure an original resemblance. The tabular analysis which follows may help to make this clearer.

THE APOSTLES' CREED	THE NICENE CREED
(AS A TYPICAL WESTERN CREED).	(AS A TYPICAL EASTERN CREED).
Words or clauses enclosed in single brackets did not belong to the oldest form of the Creed, but were added in the course of its history. Words or clauses printed in italics are parallel in general sense, but not in expression, to the corresponding portion of the Eastern Creed.	*Words or clauses enclosed in single brackets were present in some, but not in all, forms of the Eastern Creed. Words or clauses in heavy brackets have nothing corresponding to them in the Western Creed. Words or clauses printed in italics agree in general sense, but not in expression, with the corresponding portion of the Western Creed.*
I. 1. *I* believe in God,	I. 1. *We* believe in [One] God,
Father,	Father,
Almighty,	Almighty,
[Creator[a].]	Creator.

---

[a] The present clause does not appear in texts of the Creed until *c.* 700 A.D., but equivalents are found sporadically much earlier.

II. 2.	And in *Christ Jesus*,[a] His only-begotten Son, *Our* Lord;	II. 2.	And in [One] Lord *Jesus Christ*, His only-begotten Son, [Eternally begotten, Very God, Of one substance with the Father, Agent in all creation;]
3.	[*Conceived*[b]] of the Holy Ghost *Born*[b] of the Virgin Mary;	3.	*For our salvation descended*, *And*[a] *incarnate*, *And made man;*
4.	[Suffered[c]] under Pontius Pilate, Crucified, [dead[d]] and Buried,	4.	[*Crucified under Pontius Pilate*[b],] *And* suffered, [*And* was buried[c],]
5.	[Descended into Hades[e]], Rose again the third day;	5.	*And* rose again the third day;
6.	Ascended into heaven, Sitteth at the right hand of God, [The Father, Almighty[f];]	6.	*And* ascended into heaven, [*And* sitteth at the right hand of the Father[d];]
7.	*Whence*[g] He shall come	7.	*And* cometh [[again

---

[a] '*Christ Jesus*' is the order in the oldest authorities.

[b] The oldest form is 'Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.'

[c] 'Suffered' appears first in Priscillian (Spanish, *ob.* 385) and in Nicetas of Remesiana (in Dacia, *c.* 400). The oldest form is 'Crucified and buried.'

[d] First in Nicetas.

[e] First in Rufinus of Aquileia, *c.* 400.

[f] These additions appear first in Priscillian.

[g] Later authorities (Priscillian, Rufinus *al.*) have '*Thence*.'

[a] Asyndeton is characteristic of Western creeds, polysyndeton of Eastern.

[b] These words are found in some only of the Eastern creeds, but always in this order, whereas the Western order places 'under Pontius Pilate' before 'crucified.'

[c] Not in the true Nicene Creed nor in the Creed of Caesarea.

[d] Also wanting in the Creed of Nicaea. The Creed of Caesarea has 'Ascended to the Father.'

to judge quick and dead.	with glory[a]]] to judge quick and dead.
	[Whose Kingdom shall have no end[b].]
III. 8. And [*I* believe] in the Holy Ghost;	8. And [*We* believe] in [One[c]] Holy Ghost, [[Lord, life-giver, Proceeding from the Father, [and the Son[d],] With the Father and the Son together worshipped and glorified[e],] Who spake by the Prophets[f];]
9. The holy [catholic[a]] Church[b]; [The Communion of Saints[c];]	9. *And* in [One] holy catholic [and apostolic] Church;

---

[a] First in Nicetas.

[b] The African form (current in the time of Cyprian) of this and the following clauses is 'Remission of sins, resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life, through holy Church.'

[c] First in Nicetas, then in Caesarius of Arles (*ob.* 542).

[a] Characteristic of most, but not all, forms of Eastern creed, and wanting in the original Creed of Nicaea.

[b] Absent from the Creeds of Caesarea and Nicaea, and probably inserted against Marcellus of Ancyra.

[c] Found in many Eastern creeds, though not in either form of the Nicene Creed.

[d] First, as is well known, in the Fourth Council of Toledo in 589 A.D., but may conceivably go back as far as 447 (Kattenbusch, *Apost. Symb.* i 158).

[e] These clauses on the Holy Ghost appear first in the shorter Creed of Epiphanius (374 A.D.), then in the Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 A.D. The remaining clauses, 9, 10, 11, 12, did not form part of the original Nicene Creed, and were at least not quoted by Eusebius from the Creed of Caesarea: see below.

[f] Stress on the prophetic inspiration is an early and widespread feature in Eastern creeds.

10. Remission of sins;	10. [[We confess] one Baptism for the] Remission of sins;
11. Resurrection of the flesh;	11. [We look for] the Resurrection of the [dead[a];]
[12. Eternal life[a].]	12. Life in the [next] aeon[b].

This, then, is our first observation. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds resemble each other so closely that they must be related in origin.

We shall ask presently, What is the exact nature of this relation? But before doing this, we go on to make a second observation—not of course as anything new, but as one of the postulates of this paper. The history of the Apostles' Creed is now sufficiently ascertained. In its oldest form it stands at the head of a long series of creeds current in the West. This oldest form is known to be identical with the primitive baptismal creed of the Church of Rome. The Roman Creed is really the parent of all the other provincial creeds. The present text of the Apostles' Creed is not Roman, but provincial[c]. And a little perhaps remains to be done in the way of determining by what precise process this provincial creed came to assume its dominant position. We may say in general terms that it took its shape very nearly in Southern Gaul, towards the end of the fifth century, and that perhaps it owes its predominance to the relations between the Carlovingian dynasty and the Church of Rome in the eighth century. But this belongs to a later stage in the history with which we are not concerned. The main fact is that the Apostles' Creed is really the local Roman Creed throwing out branches throughout the West.

---

[a] Found in the African creed, but not in the Old Roman, Priscillian, or Rufinus.

[a] Early Eastern creeds vary between 'resurrection of the flesh' and 'of the dead.'

[b] The Creed of Jerusalem has 'Eternal life,' as in the Western creed (where, however, the clause is not original), for ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, in which the Nicene agrees with the creed in the Apostolic Constitutions.

[c] I gather that Mr. Burn would question this (*Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 221, 234 ff.); and his arguments will deserve further consideration. The statement in the text was based upon the observation that the additions to the Creed seem to appear one by one, and gradually to collect in Southern Gaul. But much will depend on the genuineness, or at least on the localization, of writings ascribed to Faustus of Riez (on which see Bergmann in the Bonwetsch-Seeberg *Studien*, Bd. i, Hft. 4, 1898), and to Caesarius of Arles (in regard to whom I have followed the conclusions of Kattenbusch, i 164–170).

All this is a very old story. It is only not quite so old a story that what we know as the Nicene Creed in both its forms, as well the true creed of the Council of Nicaea as the creed which afterwards came to usurp the name, really represents two local Eastern creeds. It is one of the many debts which the world owes to Dr. Hort, to have shown that the later form is based upon the creed of the Church of Jerusalem. He showed this so conclusively as to cause surprise that the relation had not been observed before. And he assumed, as I believe rightly, though we shall see that this is to some extent disputed, that the original Nicene Creed was in like manner based upon the local creed of the Church of Caesarea.

We thus have in close and organic relation to the Nicene Creed two local creeds of the fourth century, both belonging to Palestine. And by the side of these it is easy to place a number of other creeds, the existence of which is attested during the fourth and fifth centuries, representing most parts of the Christian East. And these creeds have all such a degree of general resemblance to one another that they may be said to constitute a distinct class of Eastern creeds directly confronting the creeds of the West. It is convenient to be able to take the familiar Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as leading representatives of the two classes. So that when we come back to our original question we find it placed upon a broader basis. We are no longer content to ask, What is the relation of the Nicene Creed to the Apostles'? Or, if we do ask this, we ask it as a step to the further question, What is the relation of the Eastern creeds to the Western?

This is the real problem which at the present moment exercises the greatest fascination. It is in reference to this that recent works invite summing up and estimating, and in reference to this that opinions are for the time, though I do not think that they will long continue, widest asunder.

It may be well to try to group opinions, though the different members of the groups would not be quite upon the same footing. On the one side we should have Caspari, Zahn, Loofs, and a younger writer, Kunze; on the other side, Kattenbusch and Harnack who, it is needless to add, is a host in himself.

Speaking very roughly, we may say that the former group believes that from the first, or as far back as we can go, there were two distinct types of Eastern and Western creeds branching off from a common root, that the two types are equally ancient, and that they are related to each other through this common root, which itself is, so to speak, underground out of our sight.

The second group believes that the Western creed was developed first, and had a century and a half or more of independent existence before it was carried eastwards and became the direct parent of the Eastern creeds. On the one theory the two typical creeds might be regarded as sisters; on the other, as respectively mother and daughter.

It would be superfluous to speak of the vast work of Caspari, whom Harnack describes as 'a second Ussher,' meaning that he has played in recent investigation of the Creed a part equal to that which we are proud to think that our countryman Ussher played at an earlier period. Caspari's publications cover nearly a quarter of a century (from 1866 to 1890—he died in 1892), and the labours on which they are based of course go back further still.

Caspari's great object was evidently the accumulation of a mass of carefully sifted material bearing upon the history of the Creed. He seems to have been averse to generalization. The conclusion of all his labours—or (shall we rather say?) the working hypothesis which guided him through them—is expressed in a single modest paragraph, barely exceeding five lines in length, which occurs in the midst of detailed researches:

'After what we have been saying, we may, and indeed must assume, that the Creed came to Rome on the boundary-line between the Apostolic and the sub-Apostolic age substantially in the form which it has in the Old Roman Creed, and probably from Asia Minor, from the Johannean circle, which may well have been its birthplace' (*Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, &c.* iii 161).

Zahn, whose concise and valuable, if popular, treatise has recently been laid before the English public by Mr.—and I presume Mrs.—A. E. Burn[a], in the main points agrees with Caspari, but has defined the process in a way that has met with some opposition and criticism. We may give the theory in his own words, which have the advantage of sketching out the main lines of creed-development in a short compass.

'The Creed has its roots in Christ's command to baptize. Against the authenticity of that command no historical reasons worthy of consideration have been brought forward. It was necessary that the newly converted should confess their faith, both before and at the time of their baptism. On this condition they were baptized; and out of the baptismal formula grew a baptismal confession, which had already assumed a more or less stereotyped form in early Apostolic times. At a somewhat later period, somewhere between 70–120 A.D., the original formula, which reminds us of the Jewish origin of Christianity, was reconstructed. Thus, it appeared better suited to the needs of the baptized, who mostly came out of heathendom. This altered formula was very soon widely known. We find it at Ephesus in 130 [i. e. at the baptism of Justin]; at Rome in 145 [i. e. implied in the history of Marcion], and again between 180–210, at Carthage, Lyons, and Smyrna [i. e. in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and in the confession of faith ascribed by Hippolytus to the presbyters who debated with Noetus]. It also forms the groundwork of all the later baptismal confessions of the Eastern Churches. Between the years 200–220 the first article was slightly altered in Rome. . . . This altered form was adopted by the Churches of Italy, of Africa, and probably also of the south of France. For many generations the Roman Church, and a few Churches closely united to Rome, held strictly to this form, which had been published in Rome early in the third century. In all the other Churches the Creed was thenceforward developed with considerable freedom. In the East, where the Roman recension of 200–220 could not find an entrance, its course was other than in the West; in Carthage other than in Aquileia. The inner and outer factors which determined these provincial developments, and the exchanges between the different Churches, are for the most part unknown to history. The

---

[a] *The Articles of the Apostles' Creed*, London, 1899, and *Expositor*, 1898.

Gallican Church of the third and fourth centuries especially lies for us in utter darkness with regard to this as to many other points. And yet it seems that it was in that very South Gallican Church, during the fifth century, that the revision of the Creed, which was to spread all over the West and supersede all the other forms, took its final impulse' (*The Apostles' Creed*, pp. 97–100).

The characteristic feature in this reconstruction of the history is the supposed Roman recension of the years 200–220 which, as I have said, has not been allowed to pass unchallenged. And there are other particulars which I think would be better stated rather differently. Where Zahn differs from Loofs, I prefer the form which the theory takes in the hands of Loofs.

This writer, who has expressed his views in a notice of Kattenbusch in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1895, speaks with the caution of one who sees a scientific problem in course of active prosecution around him, but is not able himself to contribute to it at the moment quite on the scale and with the thoroughness which he would desire. But in spite of this reserve, he seems to me to lay his finger on the really critical point in a way to which I shall return before I have done.

Kunze, who is now *Privatdocent* at Leipzig, made his début with a work of some merit, entitled *Marcus Eremita, a New Witness for the Baptismal Confession of the Early Church* (Leipzig, 1895). He writes rather with the dogmatism of youth, and in particular attacks Kattenbusch in a way that is both exaggerated and unbecoming. He was sharply rebuked by Harnack in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, and has been gently and generously treated by Kattenbusch. The contribution which the 'new witness' makes to the history of the Creed is something, but not as much as it would be if we could be sure that the Creed of Marcus was really the local creed of Ancyra. On the general question Kunze clearly takes rank on the same side as Loofs and Caspari.

Kattenbusch, Professor at Giessen, who is also known for an elaborate work on the *Doctrine of the Eastern Church* (1892), part of a largely planned comparative treatment of the Confessions of Christendom, has taken up more than any one else the systematic labours of Caspari, but not exactly in the same way. Caspari's was mainly research in libraries. Kattenbusch operates rather with already printed texts, hunting up the traces of creeds out of obscure corners, carefully comparing them, checking the critical process of reconstruction, and putting them into relation to each other. Kattenbusch is exceedingly painstaking and conscientious, though hardly a writer of first-rate power. It is no small labour to follow his investigations, which are often very minute, often (and quite rightly, considering the state of the materials) left with a large margin of uncertainty, and not very much helped by bold, clear grouping. He has, if I am not mistaken, the special claim upon our sympathy of one who discovers slowly and painfully in the course of his research that the working hypothesis with which he started (not explicitly, but at the back of his mind) is wrong and untenable. I suspect that this has had something to do with the delayed appearance of his second volume, which still wants its concluding half. This book of Kattenbusch's is an example of the difficulty of conducting research and exposition at the same time. Materials are so abundant that they need to be put into print before they can be properly weighed; and, while this is being done, the leading idea which determines their grouping has to be assumed before it has been adequately tested.

Harnack's work on the history of the Creed, with a writer of less exuberant energy and fertility, might well have formed the special study of a lifetime. With him it is hardly more than a πάρεργον, but a πάρεργον in which he evidently takes great interest. He has recently given expression to his views in a number of places. First, in the popular pamphlet (published in 1892) which caused considerable stir in Germany; then in a reply to Dr. Cremer, which followed in the same year; then in an elaborate note in the English translation, and in the third edition, of the *History of Dogma* (i 157 ff), and more recently and fully in the article on the Apostles' Creed in the new edition of Hauck-Herzog, *Real-encyklopädie* (cited below as *PRE*[3]), which is just one of those brilliant and masterly summaries to which we are accustomed from him[a].

---

[a] Mention may also be made of the very convenient collection of material added by him as an appendix to the new (third) edition of Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole* (cited below as Hahn[3]) pp. 364–390.

Harnack and Kattenbusch agree in maintaining that the old Roman Creed, the shortest and simplest form of the Apostles' Creed, is not a variety of a previously existing creed, but itself the oldest piece of creed-production, the starting-point of the whole development. Harnack puts its date 140–150, Kattenbusch still earlier ± 100.

Both Kattenbusch and Harnack refuse to distinguish an Eastern and Western type of creed before the end of the third century. They both believe that the Eastern Creeds, as they have come down to us, are directly dependent upon the Western. They believe that the old Roman Creed was carried across to Antioch at the time of, or soon after, the settlement of the disputes there in reference to Paul of Samosata by Aurelian, *c.* 272 A.D.

This is no doubt the most important part of the problem as it lies before us at the present time, to determine which of the two views is right, that of those who hold, or of those who deny, that there was a distinct Oriental type of baptismal creed more or less widely diffused throughout the Churches at a date anterior to 272, and indeed coaeval with the Roman Creed.

At the present moment Kattenbusch and Harnack may be regarded as to this extent in possession of the field, that they have stated their case the more fully. Their opponents have made us aware of their opinions, and have hinted at some of the grounds on which they rest, but they have not as yet joined issue along the line.

In spite of this disadvantage I will venture to record my vote, such as it is, for the followers of Caspari; and that on the double ground of what seem to me flaws in the arguments of the opposing side, and of positive indications in their favour.

In attempting to test this question I will deal mainly with Harnack; and this may be a suitable opportunity to offer some more general remarks upon the methods of that illustrious scholar. I have spoken of his summary of the subject as brilliant and masterly. Those are epithets which his work seems to me constantly to deserve. It is impossible not to envy the extraordinary physical vitality, the intellectual keenness and vigour which enter into his work. No one on this side the water for a moment grudges him the pre-eminent position which he enjoys, most fitly marked by the offer understood to have been made to him by the University of Cambridge of an honorary degree. At the same time, I seem to note in his work certain recurring and even characteristic defects by the side of its more conspicuous excellences. I rarely find a point that can be taken omitted. The combined breadth of view and penetrative argument is most striking; but I often find myself differing as to the proportionate value of arguments. It seems to me that these are often strict where they need to be relaxed, and lax where they ought to be strict. In particular I am inclined to question the use that is made of the absence of evidence, which is too often treated as though it were the same thing as negative evidence, whereas really the two things are very different.

The denial of the existence of specifically Eastern Creeds before 272 A.D. turns largely upon the absence of evidence. But in such a case the first question we have to ask ourselves is, To what does this absence of evidence amount? Where there is no literature there can be no literary evidence. But how much literature is there for the whole of Asia Minor, including Cappadocia and Cilicia, for Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine, say from the time of Melito of Sardis to that of Eusebius? Or, indeed how much literature is there between these dates for the whole of the Christian East with the one exception of Alexandria or Hellenized Egypt? I believe that even the scanty evidence there is supplies a fair presumption for the existence of local creeds. But if it did not, what would be the worth of the negative inference?

Those who hold that there were creeds in the East before the beginning of the fourth century usually start with the assumption that there are definite recoverable creeds of the Church of Caesarea implied in the discussions at Nicaea in the year 325, and of the Church of Jerusalem implied in the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem in the year 348. Dr. Hort e.g. starts from these two creeds, the text of which he prints in his *Two Dissertations*. Harnack lets pass the Creed of Jerusalem, but he denies the proof of a local creed at Caesarea. He says that the creed given by Eusebius was not the local creed, but a creed specially drawn up by him with a view to the Council.

In the pastoral letter addressed to his diocese, Eusebius gives the opening of the statement which he laid before the Council thus:—

'According as we received from the bishops who were before us both when we were catechized and when we received baptism (καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν), and according to what we have learned from the holy scriptures, and as we have believed and been in the habit of teaching in our own presbyterate as well as in our episcopate, so we still believe, and lay the statement of our belief before you' (Socr. *H. E.* i 8). Then follows the well-known creed.

Harnack allows (as it is impossible not to allow) that this creed represents the teaching current in the Church at Caesarea, but he denies that it was in use *totidem verbis* as a creed. Yet if Eusebius had wanted to describe the baptismal creed of his Church, it is difficult to see what closer language he could have used than καθὼς παρελάβομεν . . . καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν (the imperf. probably points to the *preparation for* baptism). Would not these words exactly suit such a course of catechetical lectures as those delivered by St. Cyril at Jerusalem twenty-three years later? Yet those lectures were directly based upon a creed.

We must needs bring to bear the analogy of this neighbouring Church. If a creed was in regular use at Jerusalem, is it likely to have been otherwise at Caesarea? And is not the creed ascribed to that Church just what we should have expected to find there, if the Churches of the East were in the habit of using their own local varieties of the same original creed?

Facies non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.

Harnack has another argument. The Jerusalem Creed certainly had the Appendix to its third paragraph, which is such a striking link of connexion between the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds (the clauses of the Church, forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, or of the body, [eternal life]). Eusebius does not reproduce this. He breaks off abruptly at 'We believe also in one Holy Spirit.' It has been commonly assumed (amongst others by Dr. Hort) that he did this simply because he confined himself to that portion of the Creed which was relevant to his purpose. The true Creed of Nicaea ends at the same place. Harnack maintains that the supposition that Eusebius left out anything is 'highly precarious.' To me it seems most natural that he should do so. And, indeed, when we read Eusebius' letter, and observe how he at once takes up in his comment the three Trinitarian articles, we see that to quote the Appendix in full would have only interrupted his argument [a].

Fortunately we are not left to subjective impressions one way or the other. We have another analogous case which shows exactly how the disputants of the day felt themselves stand towards the clauses of the Appendix. The First Antiochene Formula of 341 A.D. ends, 'We also believe in the Holy Ghost. And if we are to go on (εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι), we believe besides in the resurrection of the flesh, and in eternal life' (Socrates, *H. E.* ii 10: Hahn ^{3} § 153). Clearly there was a sense that these further clauses were detachable from the main body of the Creed, and might be quoted, or not, as suited the purpose of the speaker.

It seems to me therefore that both Harnack's objections are of the nature of refinements—needless and uncalled-for refinements—which under an appearance of exact science only serve to divert a plain and natural inference.

But if we once admit that the creed laid by Eusebius before the Council was the local creed of his Church, then I cannot but think that the theory of Kattenbusch and Harnack breaks down altogether. Bishop Lightfoot in his famous article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* puts the birth of Eusebius about 260 A.D., so that he would be something like twelve years old when Aurelian intervened in the affairs of Antioch. In other words, he was in all probability already baptized, and had already been catechized in the Caesarean Creed, at a time when, on the Kattenbusch-Harnack hypothesis, the parent of that creed had not yet reached Antioch—much less Caesarea or Jerusalem. With that one fact the whole edifice collapses.

Even if there had been a slight probability on Harnack's side instead of against him, I submit that he should have reflected what a slender thread his theory was hanging by, and how entirely it would fall to the ground if this one postulate were otherwise in fact than he assumed. The precariousness of the situation was with him and not with his opponents.

---

[a] It is a similar case to the argument for the omission of the doxology in Matt. vi 13 from the fact that ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε is meant to link on directly to ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν, and the doxology breaks this connexion.

The argument just used is a short cut which, looking at it as dispassionately as I can, does not seem to me less decisive because it is short. But I believe that we should arrive at the same result if we go the whole round of the East and examine the evidence relating to the several Churches one by one.

Harnack and Kattenbusch, I submit again, forget the difficulty of proving a negative, and as they pass from one item of evidence to another are not as much troubled as they should be by the residual possibilities which they are leaving behind them.

One positive argument there is against the existence of a definite type of creed in the East, viz. that derived from the two short confessions of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Aphraates (Hahn³ §§ 185, 16). These are so divergent from the common type as to suggest the inference that their authors were not acquainted with it. The inference may hold good in the case of Aphraates. But in a Syriac writer, beyond the Tigris and outside the limits of the Roman world, this would no more surprise us than that he should not show signs of acquaintance with the Catholic Epistles. The case of Gregory Thaumaturgus has perhaps rather more significance. The extent of this we shall try to estimate later.

If we take a survey of the Eastern Churches during the Ante-Nicene period we naturally find the most abundant material in Egypt. Kattenbusch has discussed this at length, both in his first and in his second volume. We do not, however, as it seems to me, reach daylight until we come to the small print appendix at the end of the treatment in vol. ii, and then rather in spite of the author.

Kattenbusch begins by admitting the substantial genuineness of the baptismal interrogations in the so-called 'Egyptian Church Order' (preserved in the Coptic version of the Apostolic Constitutions), a shorter and older form of which is found in the Canons ascribed to Hippolytus. Kattenbusch agrees with Achelis and most other scholars in accepting these as really traceable to Hippolytus of Rome, and he thus accounts for the resemblance which the interrogations present to the clauses of the Roman Creed. These interrogations were in use in Egypt in the third century, and they are the only factor that Kattenbusch finds it necessary to assume to explain the phenomena, with the addition of some knowledge of the Roman Creed itself, which he attributes to Origen in the latter part of his life. He questions the existence of an Egyptian Creed, properly so called.

But in the appendix to his second discussion of the subject in vol. ii, he prints a form of creed, brought to his notice by Preuschen, which is said to have been used by Macarius the Great, a hermit of the Scetic desert, whose life extended over ninety years of the fourth century, in an interview with a Hierakite heretic, which seems to be historical.

Now this creed has striking points of contact on the one hand with the letter of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, to his namesake of Constantinople in 323 A. D., and on the other hand, with the confession of Arius about 321 A. D. (both Ante-Nicene). And it is further to be observed that some of the more marked expressions, (τὸν) ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐπιδημήσαντα ἐν σαρκί, are not only common to Macarius and Alexander, but occur, as Kattenbusch candidly points out, with considerable frequency in the writings of St. Athanasius.

I have little doubt that these coincidences really point to an Egyptian Creed (see also Kattenbusch, ii 251, 253). When once we assume this, the lengthened investigations of the language of Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, and Clement will take a different colour. Kattenbusch repeatedly admits that their language would be consistent with the use of a creed, and only says that it does not require it. It would actually require it if we could be sure that some of Rufinus' translations accurately represented their original. In any case, I should have been prepared to say that it at least *favoured* the use of a creed. And when we bring in these clear indications from the end of the period, that use appears to be raised to a high degree of probability.

When we pass on to Syria and Palestine, the material is ample for the fourth century, scanty for the third. The facts here (with the exception of what has been said above about the Creed of Caesarea) would, for the most part, be explicable upon the hypothesis of Kattenbusch and Harnack, who believe that Antioch was the centre for the dissemination of the Roman Creed throughout the East, and who assign an important part in this dissemination to Lucian and his school.

Kattenbusch, however, shows himself conscious that an objection may be drawn to his view from the Syriac *Didascalia*, which forms the base of *Apost. Constitt.* vi 30 (printed side by side, ii 206). Funk, who has examined the date of this work most fully, assigns it to the first half of the third century. Harnack would place the original *Didascalia* in the first half, but the copy used by the Syriac translator in the second half of the century; Kattenbusch would put it *after* Paul of Samosata. On his theory (and Harnack's) it cannot be earlier; for it implies a creed like the Roman. The allies must feel that the dates are again becoming rather uncomfortably crowded. And in the background there is the Creed of Caesarea.

For Cappadocia we have a state of things which, on a smaller scale, is rather like that in regard to Egypt. The only extant Ante-Nicene literature is Firmilian's letter to Cyprian (*Ep.* lxxv in the Cyprianic collection). Now just as there is one conspicuous passage in the writings of Clement (*Strom.* vii 15 § 90; Kattenbusch, ii 118) which, though it does not exactly prove, yet seems distinctly to favour the regular use of a creed, so also in this letter of Firmilian's there is one paragraph which seems to point to a like conclusion. Firmilian is arguing on the question as to the necessity for repeating baptism given by heretics; and in § 11 he quotes what is to him the horrible case of a woman who had been impelled by a demon to baptize. It only made the matter worse that the baptism was administered with all the regular forms: *cui nec symbolum trinitatis nec interrogatio legitima et ecclesiastica defuit* (cf. *usitata et legitima verba interrogationis* in the preceding §).

I do not press *symbolum trinitatis*[a], because it might be difficult to say for what it stood in Firmilian's Greek, or that it necessarily implied more than baptism in the Threefold Name. But when we remember how constantly elsewhere (including Egypt and, we may say, Palestine) the formulae of interrogation required answers modelled upon the local creed, it is fair to presume that this would be the case in Cappadocia, and the words *legitima et ecclesiastica* seem to me to suggest at once something fuller than a bare confession of the Trinity, and something more in touch with the usage of the rest of the Christian world.

But however this may be, I must needs think that we have the same sort of verification here that there is in the case of the Egyptian Creed. The Third Formula of Antioch in 341 is expressly ascribed to Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana, one of the cities of Cappadocia. Now Kattenbusch himself has noticed the sort of triangular relation which subsists between the confession of Theophronius, a confession of another Cappadocian, the Sophist Asterius, and the Second Formula of Antioch. There are striking points of contact between each of these confessions Indeed, so far does this go, that in a small print appendix of his second volume, Kattenbusch admits the possibility that the Second Formula of Antioch may have been actually inspired by Asterius (ii 264 f.). But I think we may venture to draw for him the conclusion which he refuses to draw for himself—that Asterius, Theophronius, and both the Second and Third Antiochene Creeds are all based on a form of creed current in Cappadocia, just as we drew a similar inference as to the relation of Arius, Alexander, and Macarius the Great to a form of creed current in Egypt. Students of Dr. Hort's *Two Dissertations* may be interested to know that a characteristic feature of the Cappadocian Creed was its use of the phrase *μονογενὴς θεός*.

---

[a] σύμβολον, in the sense of 'creed,' is said to be not found earlier than Cyril of Alexandria.

If we could take over Kunze's conclusion that the Creed of Marcus the Hermit is really the local creed of Ancyra, we should then have a local creed established for Galatia. But although Zahn wholly, and Harnack partially, are inclined to assent to this proposition, both Loofs and Kattenbusch demur, and, as at present advised, I should find myself on the side of the doubters. In any case, the Creed of Marcus cannot be localized with so much certainty as to become a determining factor in the argument.

Kunze may perhaps have something to say about the original Creed of Byzantium, but it is not likely that that will have any more vital bearing upon the main issue.

In regard to the province of Asia one little creed stands out—the confession of faith put forward by the presbyters against Noetus (Routh, *Script. Eccl. Opusc.* i 50). But this, and the great question of Irenaeus, I may reserve for a little longer.

Looking back over the course by which we have travelled, I cannot but think that, considering the scantiness of the material accessible to us, the indications are really by no means slight that there were local creeds existing before the time of Aurelian in Egypt, in Palestine, in Syria, and in Eastern Asia Minor.

If Harnack does not admit this, he yet makes some important concessions towards those who maintain it. These concessions deserve to be stated as examples of his resourcefulness and strenuous way of facing a complex problem. They will also show how he regards a considerable part at least of the phenomena on which the opposing case may be supposed to rest.

'The result of our investigation,' he says, 'is not purely negative; rather we can allow that the advocates of a primitive Oriental type of creed, up to a certain point, are in the right. There did, in fact, exist as far back as the beginning of the second century in the East (that is, in Asia Minor, or in Asia Minor and Syria), amongst other things, a Christological μάθημα, organically related [*blutverwandt*] to the second article of the Roman Creed, which in its peculiar parts and formulae lasted on until it passed into the Oriental Creeds of the fourth century. There existed also formulae in regard to the "One God, Creator of heaven and earth," and His incarnate Son, which also lasted on [*durchgeschlagen*] and influenced the whole course of creed-development, including many modifications of the Roman Creed in the West (the uniform theological tenor [*Haltung*] of the Oriental Creeds in the second article has its root in the primitive σαρκωθέντα). There existed, lastly, a formula which referred to the holy, prophetic Spirit, and the facts which that Spirit had proclaimed in regard to Christ. Besides these larger sections, such details as the *descensus* and *catholica* also point to the East' (Hauck-Herzog, *PRE* ^{3} i 752).

So much of the substance of the Creed is included in these admissions, that the negative which they are intended to qualify loses most of its sting. I would ask, however, whether it is not after all the simpler and more probable hypothesis that the Creed existed as a whole, undergoing slight modifications in the different localities, but with the definite type everywhere in the background, than to suppose that these floating and fluid μαθήματα retained their shape and cohesion down to the fourth century.

But on the other hand I should be prepared myself to make a concession which might perhaps go some little way to meet Harnack's objections. I believe that the existence of a formulated creed goes back as far in the East as in the West, but I believe that there was a perceptible difference in its use during the period before the Arian controversy. This difference, however, I should be inclined to refer to psychological causes. The two leading representatives of Greek and Latin theology at this period are Tertullian and Origen. Does not the mere mention of those two names suggest at once all the explanation we need? I do not mean only that it explains the difference of type between the Eastern and the Western Creeds—though it does explain that most abundantly—but I mean also that it explains the greater craving on the one side than on the other for a fixed definite objective authority, and the greater frequency of the appeal to that authority. It was not so natural to the speculative Eastern mind to bind itself by rule as it was to the legal unspeculative West. Tertullian and Origen are only very pointed examples of the general tendency of the Western and Eastern mind. I doubt if it is necessary to go beyond this kind of consideration to account for the comparative eccentricity of the Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus. I seek the solution rather in the man than in the conditions.

If we may consider that the position has now been made good that the Eastern branch of the Creed as well as the Western already existed in the third century, the only remaining question will be, how much further back we can trace it, and what was its ultimate relation to the Western branch and to the original Creed. Here comes in a valuable observation made by Dr. Loofs. The writings of Irenaeus contain a number of creed-like passages, or passages which have every appearance of being based upon a creed [a]. These passages were collected by Harnack in vol. i of his (and von Gebhardt's) edition of the Apostolic Fathers. Now Dr. Loofs has remarked, what is indeed evident as soon as our attention is called to it, that Irenaeus already has many of the most characteristic expressions of the Eastern Creeds. He inserts ἕνα in both the two first articles ἕνα Θεόν, ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. He clearly had a clause corresponding to ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς. He had παθόντα, and σταυρωθέντα with ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου after instead of before it. He seems also to have had ἐν δόξῃ of the Second Coming. Along with these peculiarities, every one of which is distinctively Eastern, Irenaeus has one only which is characteristic of the oldest form of the Western Creed—in three well-attested places Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν for Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. It is quite possible that this really belongs to the primitive Creed.

---

[a] Harnack's denial (in his latest work, *PRE*^{3} i 752) that they really are so based seems to me to be a paradox. But it is fair to say that I have not before me his article in the *Zeitschrift f. Theol. u. Kirche*, iv 149 ff.

But in regard to the others, is it not natural and obvious to infer that the separation of the Eastern and the Western types had already taken place, and that Irenaeus himself had carried with him the creed of his home in Smyrna? This inference is confirmed by the brief confession of the Presbyters in Hippolytus *c. Noetum* I. That too has ἕνα θεόν; it has παθόντα and ἀποθανόντα—both originally Eastern. There is perhaps more room to doubt about Justin, though he too has two or three of the Eastern peculiarities.

But if Irenaeus took an Eastern Creed from his home, that would carry back the type to the middle of the second century. Much further than this I doubt if we should go. For this main reason: Zahn is of opinion that ἕνα (before θεόν) was part of the primitive Creed, and that this was dropped out and πατέρα inserted in his hypothetical Roman recension of 200–220 A.D. But would it not be better to invert this? The three first peculiarities of the Eastern Creeds, ἕνα θεόν, with ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, and ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, are obviously controversial and aimed against the Gnostics, with their multitude of aeons, their Demiurge, and their separation of Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός[a]. But, that being so, it is surely natural to put the non-controversial form first. The primitive Creed arose, it is fair to believe, before the controversies of the second century became acute. And the primitive Creed corresponded more nearly to the Roman type than to the Oriental. The Eastern mind played upon it; and, as a result of that play, what began with a close resemblance to the Apostles' Creed ended with a close resemblance to the Nicene.

W. SANDAY.

---

[a] Zahn (*op. cit.* p. 61) adopts the alternative explanation that the changes were made under the stress of the Monarchian controversy. It is perhaps somewhat in his favour that Tertullian, as well as Irenaeus, has *unicum* or *unum deum*. But may not he too have been influenced by the Eastern Creed, through his intimate relations with Asia Minor?

ANSELM'S ARGUMENT FOR THE BEING OF GOD—ITS HISTORY AND WHAT IT PROVES.

THE so-called ontological proof of the being of God is at first sight a very strange piece of theological dialectic, and it has gone through a curious history. Stated first by Anselm, it was generally rejected by the Schoolmen on grounds already pressed against it in Anselm's time by the monk Gaunilo. It was revived in a somewhat modified form by Descartes, and again attacked, first by Gassendi, and subsequently by Kant, on substantially the same grounds which had been alleged by Gaunilo. Finally, it was defended in a somewhat ambiguous way by Hegel, who maintained that it represents a valid process of thought under a form that conceals its real import and cogency. It may be useful to reconsider its history and meaning.

It is ostensibly an argument from the conception of God in our minds to His existence as an objective reality; and it is put by Anselm in regular syllogistic form. Scripture, he argues, has truly declared the man 'who hath said in his heart that there is no God,' to be a fool; for no one can deny God's existence without contradicting himself. He, like every one who uses the word God, must conceive Him as the greatest of beings. That, indeed, is a mere analytic judgement; for, unless we thought of a greatest of beings, we should not think of God at all. But this predicate 'greatest,' or 'that beyond which nothing greater can be conceived,' involves existence; for God would not be the greatest that can be conceived, if He were a mere idea, a mere subjective appearance, and not also an objective reality. If God were only an idea, we could think of something greater than God: of a Being, who was not merely in our thoughts, but also in existence.

To this reasoning, Gaunilo made the natural objection that we cannot take the mere idea of a thing as proving its existence. We can argue, he asserts, from essence to essence, from existence to existence; but we cannot legitimately cross over from essence to existence. Otherwise, we could easily prove the reality of anything which we can set before us in thought. Think of an island in the ocean, which we may call a lost island because no one has ever been able to find it, an island of the blessed, richer, more fertile, more delightful than any that we know, an island perfect in every respect: must we not regard existence as one of the elements included in its perfection? May we not, then, argue that, as such an island existing would be more perfect than the mere thought of it, therefore such an island exists? The *salto mortale* from thought to existence might just as well be made in behalf of a perfect island as of a Being perfect in all respects, and it is as impossible in the one case as in the other. What Anselm really proves is that, if a being corresponding to our thought of the greatest being could otherwise be shown to exist, He would necessarily be self-subsistent, a being whose existence was derived from Himself.

The answer which Anselm makes to these objections is that there is an essential distinction between the idea of God and all other ideas; it is the one and only idea which overreaches the difference between thought and reality. 'Everything can be thought *not to be* except that which *is* supremely. In other words, all those things can be conceived not to be which have beginning or end or combination of parts—whatever, in short, is in time or place, and is not an absolute whole—while that alone cannot be thought not to be, in which there is neither beginning nor end nor combination of parts, and which no thought ever finds except as always and everywhere whole.' It appears, therefore, that by 'that than which nothing greater can be conceived,' Anselm means the Absolute, as a unity which is beyond all limitation and difference. And his contention is that we have a consciousness of an infinite Being, not merely in the sense of that which is beyond any greatness that may be given, but in the sense of an absolute totality in unity, which has nothing beyond it and can be limited by nothing but itself, and that such a consciousness cannot be conceived as a *mere* thought, which is a phenomenon of our subjectivity.

The defect, however, of this argument, as Anselm states it, is that it seems to start with the opposition of subject and object, as if it were an absolute opposition, in which there were mere ideas on one side and pure realities on the other ; and then goes on to bring in a consciousness of the unity which transcends this opposition as if *it* were one of these ideas. But if we hold to the opposition, we cannot make a bridge from thought to existence by means of the mere thought of existence. In other words, existence can neither in this, nor in any other case, be added on to thought by any extension of its content. For, even if the content added be that of the unity of thought and being, it cannot enable us to go beyond the form of thought itself, or pass over from it to the form of reality. To admit such a transition, we must assume that very unity we seek to prove ; and that is just what Anselm does. He assumes, in short, that an addition to the *content* of thought will make it more than thought, and will break through the opposition, which he started by assuming, between thought and reality. But if such a unity can be reached at all, it can only be by a reconsideration of the grounds upon which thought was opposed to reality, and cannot be smuggled in as part of the content of thought.

This point will become clearer if we follow the Cartesian reproduction of the argument. Descartes had laid down the principle that 'if we form no judgement except regarding objects that are clearly and distinctly represented to us by the understanding, we can never be deceived' ; and in his *Fifth Meditation*, he goes on first to illustrate this by the mathematical relations of things, and then to apply it to the idea of God. 'I discover,' he says, 'in my mind innumerable ideas of objects, which cannot be esteemed pure negations, though they perhaps possess no reality beyond my thought, and which are not framed by me—although it may be in my power to think or not to think them—but have true and immutable natures of their own. So, for example, when I imagine a triangle, though there perhaps is not and never was in any place in the universe such a figure, it remains nevertheless true that this figure possesses a certain determinate nature, form, or essence, which is immutable and eternal and not framed by me nor in any degree dependent on my thought: as appears from the circumstance that various properties of the triangle may be demonstrated; for example, that its three angles are equal to two right angles, that its greatest side is subtended by its greatest angle, and the like; which properties, whether I will or not, I clearly discern to belong to it—though I did not think of them at all beforehand, when for the first time I recognized a triangle as such—and which accordingly cannot be said to be invented by me.' Then, after dwelling on the fact that in this way our clear and distinct apprehension of certain geometrical relations gives us true knowledge, he goes on to say, 'But now, if from the very fact that I can draw from my thought the idea of an object, it follows that all that I clearly and distinctly recognize to pertain to that object, really pertains to it, may I not derive from this an argument for the being of God, and, indeed, a demonstrative proof of it? It is as certain that I find in me the idea of God as that I find in me the idea of any figure or number—the idea, that is, of a Being supremely perfect; and I apprehend that an actual and eternal existence belongs to His nature no less clearly than I apprehend that all I can demonstrate of any figure or number veritably belongs to the nature of that figure or number. Hence, even though all the conclusions I have reached in the previous *Meditations* were proved to be invalid, the existence of God would pass with me for a truth at least as certain as I ever judged any of the truths of mathematics to be; though, indeed, such an argument may not immediately seem to be self-evident, but rather to have much of the appearance of a sophism. For, as I am accustomed in all other cases to make a distinction between essence and existence, it seems natural for me to believe that the existence of God also is separate from His essence, and that I can conceive of God as not actually existing. But nevertheless, when I consider the matter more attentively, I see manifestly that the existence of God can no more be separated from His essence than the property of having its angles equal to two right angles can be separated from the essence of a triangle, or the idea of a mountain from that of a valley; so that it is not less impossible to conceive of a God, that is, of a Being supremely perfect, to whom existence is wanting, or, in other words, of a God to whom a particular perfection is wanting, than to conceive of a mountain without a valley.

‘But it will be said that, though I cannot conceive of a God without existence any more than of a mountain without a valley, yet, just as from the fact that I cannot conceive a mountain without a valley it does not follow that any mountain exists in the world, so likewise, though I conceive God as existing, it does not follow that God exists; for my thought imposes no necessity upon things. And just as I can imagine a winged horse, though there be no such creature, so I might perhaps attribute existence to God though no God existed. I answer that the cases are not analogous, and that there is a fallacy lurking under the objection. For from the fact that I cannot conceive a mountain without a valley, it does not follow that any mountain or valley is in existence, but only that the mountain and the valley, whether they do or do not exist, are inseparable from one another. Whereas, on the other hand, from the fact that I cannot conceive God except as existing, it follows that existence is inseparable from Him, and therefore that He exists; not, indeed, that my thought can cause it to be so or impose any necessity upon things, but contrariwise the necessity that is in the thing itself, i.e. the necessity of the existence of God, determines me to have this thought. For I am not at liberty to conceive a God without existence, i.e. a Being supremely perfect, who yet is without one perfection, as I am at liberty to conceive a horse with or without wings.’

Against this argument, Gassendi brought the old objection that we can only pass from thought to thought and from existence to existence, but not from thought to existence; or, as he otherwise puts it, we cannot enumerate among the perfections included in the content of the idea of God the form or act by which He exists. And this objection is taken up and urged still more forcibly by Kant, who asserts that the idea of a necessarily existing Being, a Being the very conception of whom involves existence, implies a kind of μετάβασις ἐς ἄλλο γένος. In all judgements of logical necessity we posit the predicate in reference to the subject, or as analytically contained in the idea of the subject; and therefore, if the notion of being is contained in any subject, we can produce it in the predicate. But we assert the predicate only on condition of the position of the subject of which it is predicated. We cannot, therefore, deny the predicate if we admit the subject; but nothing hinders us from denying them both together. So if God is posited, we may say that existence is necessarily one of his predicates, but we cannot say that it is necessary to posit God at all. To include the absolute position of the subject in the notion of the subject is like taking the 'is' of the copula, which merely indicates the relative or hypothetical position of the predicate, as if it expressed absolute position; it is to include in the thought of the subject the determination of it as existing and not merely as thought. But existence adds nothing to the *content* of a thought. There is no more in ten thousand actual than in ten thousand possible dollars. No doubt, there is a difference in their relation to me, when the one exists only in my thought and the other also in my purse; but the difference is extraneous to the content of the conception. Existence cannot, therefore, be inferred *a priori* from conceptions alone; it can be established only *a posteriori* by data of sense, which are determined by the conceptions of the understanding as part of the connexion of experience. But no such data can be got for the idea of God.

In all this we have only the old objection restated in terms of the Kantian philosophy. The argument, in all its different forms, seems to start with the opposition of thought and being, and then, by means of the special content of the idea of God, it attempts to make a bridge between thought and being; but the bridge *ex hypothesi* can never reach the opposite side. Kant seems to get beyond this dualistic presupposition in so far as he shows that we determine objects as such through our thought; but this conclusion he immediately qualifies by maintaining that the thought which apprehends the object is not pure thought, but thought as determining a given matter of sense; and the object so reached is therefore only phenomenal. But for pure thought to apprehend objects, and objects which are not phenomenal but real, remains for Kant an impossibility.

Kant, however, as often, shows us the bottom of the difficulty and the way out of it, a way that was already indicated by Descartes when he said that the idea of God was not simply one idea among others which we *may* have, but that it is an idea which we *must* have, an idea which is presupposed in the consciousness of self as in the consciousness of objects, and which therefore we cannot refuse to admit, if we assert the validity of self-consciousness or that of the consciousness of objects. This argument is stated by Descartes—not in immediate connexion with the ontological argument, but in an earlier part of the *Meditations*—where he says that we cannot be conscious of ourselves except in relation to a Being more complete than ourselves and who is indeed the absolute standard of completeness. 'It ought not to be imagined that we do not conceive the infinite by a true idea but only by the negation of that which is finite, as we comprehend rest and darkness by the negation of movement and light: since on the contrary I see evidently that there is more reality in the infinite than in the finite substance, and therefore that I have the idea of the infinite in me prior to the idea of the finite, i.e. that in me the idea of God is prior to the idea of myself: for how would it be possible that I should be conscious that I doubt or desire, i.e. that there is something wanting to me and that I am not all perfect, if I had not in me the idea of a more perfect being than myself by comparison with whom I am conscious of the defects of my own nature?' Descartes then goes on to maintain that we do not first posit the finite, and then by thinking away its limit come to the idea of the infinite, but that, contrariwise, the idea of the infinite is the positive basis of all thought of the finite. 'This idea,' he says, 'is quite clear and distinct; for all that my mind conceives clearly and distinctly of what is real and true and contains in it any perfection, is contained and comprised entirely in this idea. Nor is it any argument against this that I do not comprehend the infinite, and that there are in God an infinity of things which I cannot understand or in any way attain to by my thought. For it is of the nature of the infinite that I, who am finite and limited, cannot comprehend it. It suffices that I understand this well, and that all the things which I conceive clearly and in which I know that there is some perfection—and perhaps also a multitude of others which I do not know—are in God formally or eminently. This, I say, suffices to make the idea I have of Him the most clear and distinct of all those that are in me.'

The meaning of this is, obviously, that I as a determinate or finite being am conscious of myself as a special modification or part of the infinite whole, and know myself as I know other finite things only as in it and related to it. In fact, Descartes goes on in the next *Meditation* to maintain that all knowledge of objects, and especially the knowledge of the self is reached by a negative determination of the absolute or infinite Being, who alone is conceived as having a purely positive reality and therefore a purely affirmative determination. 'There is present to my thought not only a real and positive idea of God, as of a Being supremely perfect; but also, so to speak, a certain negative idea of nothingness, i. e. of that which is infinitely removed from every kind of perfection: and thus I am a mean between God and nothingness. In other words, there is nothing to be found in me which can bring me into error, in so far as the Supreme Being has produced me: but if I consider myself as participating in some fashion in nothingness or not-being, i. e. in so far as I am not myself the Supreme Being but am in many things defective, I find myself exposed to an infinity of wants: so that I ought not to be astonished if I am deceived. And thus I know that error is not something real which depends on God, but is solely a defect.'

There is in this logic a mixture of truth and error: truth, in so far as Descartes corrects the mistake which he himself had made in the first instance, in treating self-consciousness as the primary principle of knowledge, and failing to recognize that the consciousness of self is but one element in our thought, which can be distinguished but not separated from the other elements of which we are conscious; but error, in so far as this distinction is taken as merely negative or privative, and not as involving any positive relation of the elements distinguished. The effect of this doctrine is seen at once in Spinoza, with whom the removal of all determinations, viewed as merely negative, carries us back to the sole reality of an infinite substance which yet is absolutely undeterminate. It is only by partial unfaithfulness to this view that Spinoza is able to develop any distinction of attributes and modes within his absolute substance. The truth, however, which underlies this whole movement of thought from Descartes to Spinoza is one which was partly hidden from Descartes himself, and altogether hidden from the individualistic philosophy of the next generation, viz. that the rational individual as such cannot be conscious of himself except in distinction from, and relation to, other things and beings, and must therefore know himself and all other things and beings as forming parts of one whole, one intelligible universe. Or, to put it more generally, he is a being who can know himself, as he can know all particular objects, only through the universal. This is, as we have seen, what is expressed by Descartes when he declares that the consciousness of God is prior to the consciousness of self, though unfortunately he expresses this truth in such a way that the self tends to disappear in God. Still the general truth, that the consciousness of God is not separable from but presupposed in the consciousness of self, is independent of this misconception. And it leads to a new view of the ontological argument. The thought of God ceases to be regarded simply as one among many other thoughts we *may* have, and becomes the idea of the unity which is presupposed in all our consciousness of the particular existence either of ourselves or of anything else, an idea which in some form or other we *must* have. The argument, therefore, according to this interpretation of it, is not from an idea viewed as a subjective state of the individual mind to an object corresponding to it; but rather the idea of God, by its priority to all distinction of objectivity and subjectivity, is to be regarded as at once the principle of being and of knowledge, and therefore at once objective and subjective. For, if we know all things, and especially the subject as opposed to the object, and the object as opposed to the subject, by the differentiation of a presupposed unity, it becomes absurd to treat this presupposed unity as itself a special phase of the subject. This, no doubt, alters the form of the argument—as an argument from an idea in our minds to something out of our minds, an argument presupposing the absoluteness of the very distinction which by means of the idea of God it seeks to reduce to something relative, and therefore makes the conclusion the direct negation of the premises. Rather, we are now bound to say, the division of subject and object, as a division in our consciousness, is possible only on the presupposition of a unity which is beyond the division and which manifests itself in it.

The result of this discussion, then, seems to be that we cannot give a true meaning to the ontological argument except by regarding it not as starting from thought as a subjective state in order to reach the objective, but as starting from a consciousness that, as all distinctions are relative, the ultimate principle of being and knowing must be a unity which underlies, comprehends, and is manifested in all forms of both. The true ontological argument is, therefore, an argument that begins with the idea of God, or perhaps at this stage we should rather say of the Absolute, as the unity of 'all thinking things, all objects of all thought,' and tries to unfold all the differences of subject and object, and all other differences, as subordinate to this unity.

And this at once points out the relation of the ontological argument to the other traditional arguments for the Being of God. *They* represent the regress from the finite as such to the infinite; *it* represents the return from the infinite to the finite: and either class of argument is imperfect without the other.

The argument *a contingentia mundi* and the design argument are different stages in the process of thought by which the mind rises from the finite to the infinite. Both of them in their syllogistic form are liable to the objection that they put into the conclusion more than is in the premises. But almost every one has now become aware that the strict syllogistic form does not adequately represent the real process of inference. It is far more truly represented, as Descartes tends to represent it, as a movement of thought in which the premises furnish merely a starting point which is transformed and superseded by the conclusion. Thus at first we take the finite as an absolute reality. But, so taken, it contradicts itself and points to the infinite as its truth. It might, indeed, be maintained that this is the true description of the process of reasoning or inference in all cases in which there is any real advance of thought, and not a mere analytical restatement of what is already known. The movement of thought is never a real advance, unless it brings the premises together in a unity which transforms them and gives them a new meaning. And thus, stating it epigrammatically, we might say that in every fruitful inference the conclusion contradicts the premises; though this would only be one half of the truth, for it must also reinstate them in a new form. Be this however as it may, it is evident that the case is so here, or, in other words, that the real meaning of the argument *a contingentia mundi* is that the particular existences which we at first take as self-subsistent realities are discovered to be finite and contingent, and are therefore seen to exist only in and through the infinite. And, again, the real meaning of the design argument is that the particular ends of finite existence, which at first seemed to be ends in themselves, are recognized to be only elements in, or phases of, the absolute good. On the other hand, the ontological argument in its true meaning must be taken as just the opposite counterpart of these, as expressing the movement of thought from the infinite to the finite, the movement in which the infinite or absolute manifests itself to be no mere Spinozistic substance or ἄπειρον in which all definite existence is lost—the lion's den before which all the footsteps are directed inwards and none outwards—but essentially a living principle, a principle of knowing and being, which reveals itself in the natural and spiritual world, in the existence of finite objects and in the consciousness of finite subjects, yet does not in all this differentiation lose itself or its unity. Hence it may be regarded as the peculiarly Christian argument, the process of thought corresponding to the idea of the λόγος or self-revealing nature of God. From this point of view, what we have in the argument of Anselm is only an example of that degeneration of speculative ideas into an external ratiocinative form, of which the Scholastic philosophy gives us so many instances, which in fact might be said to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of Scholasticism. This becomes still clearer when we observe that Anselm, in answering the objections of Gaunilo, is obliged to use language about the difference of the idea of God from other ideas, which implies that it is nothing else than that consciousness of the whole to which we must carry back all determination of the parts; and further that in Descartes we have a still more distinct movement in the same direction, towards the restoration of the speculative meaning of the idea. The Cartesian view, therefore, as we have seen, led immediately to the Pantheism of Spinoza, which, whatever its defects, first distinctly makes the unity of all things the presupposition and starting point from which alone we can reach a true determination of all particular and finite existence, whether natural or spiritual.

Let me put this in another form. The essential error of Scholastic philosophy is, that in it the analytic spirit is not controlled by the consciousness that every distinction is also a relation and therefore implies a unity beyond it. The consequence is that it admits—or at least consciously admits—no synthetic movement of thought, no movement that goes beyond the notions or beliefs with which we start, or crosses the boundary of any distinctions we have once made. Its thought is ruled by the principle of identity, in the sense in which that principle is understood by formal logic. Applied to the opposition of thought and reality, this means that we cannot in our argument cross from the one to the other, but must, as Gaunilo said, move only from thought to thought, from existence to existence, since the one is not analytically contained in the other, and there is no logical possibility of reaching any conclusion not analytically contained in the premises.

To this, as we saw, Anselm has no answer, except that *in this one case* thought analytically contains existence, i.e. *in this one case* the gulf between the two has been already crossed. But this means that in the very idea of God it is involved that the distinction is not absolute, and that the fact that we have that idea shows that for us there is a unity beyond the distinction, though revealing itself in it. But if this be so, the appearance of a movement from thought to existence, which was essential to the argument, is seen to be illusive, and what we really have is a recognition that in the distinction between thought and existence their ultimate unity is still presupposed. This is concealed from Anselm by the fact that he does not yet perceive, what Descartes perceived, the necessity of the idea of God and its priority to the consciousness of self; or, in other words, by the external way in which he conceived of the relations of God, the world and the self. It was natural, therefore, that St. Thomas, adhering as he did to the analytic conception of logic, should reject Anselm's *tour de force.* But in so doing, he was simply rejecting the Christian idea of God, or at least, refusing to admit it except as an unintelligible mystery.

The moment we realize what is the ὁδὸς ἄνω and the ὁδὸς κάτω to which the arguments for the being of God really point,—that they are the imperfect expression, on the one hand, of the process of thought that carries us from the presupposition of finite existence in all its different forms, through the self-contradiction of such existence when taken as absolute and independent, to the idea of the infinite unity involved in it ; and, on the other hand, of the process by which this unity defines itself or manifests what it is in all the forms of the finite, natural and spiritual, as elements in one world and one world-process,—we see that the argument for the being of God can be nothing else than the sketch of a complete philosophy. It is, in the very essence of it, absurd to take God as one Being among others of whose existence you can have a distinct proof, just as the proof of the existence of Caesar is distinct from the proof of the existence of Cromwell. In the first place to say *that* God *is*, is to say that there is a principle of unity without relation to which we cannot finally comprehend anything. It is to say that we can find no standing ground for thought, no criterion of truth or of reality, except in such a principle. And, in the second place, to show *what* God is, is to realize what is the nature of this unity that we have proved. And there is no way to do this except to follow and try to understand the whole process of its manifestation in nature and spirit, till, rejecting all partial conceptions, we arrive at our final conception of what the principle of such a world-process must be. We might, therefore, say that the argument for the being of God can be nothing but the synthesis of the whole of knowledge, the gathering up by philosophy of the whole content of the sciences in their unity. There are, in fact, no *arguments* for the being of God ; for all the sciences are steps in the one argument by which we come to understand more or less adequately the unity of the system of the world through all its differences. Or, to put it more in the language of religion, we might say that the argument for the being of God has two steps : one in which we discover the nothingness of the finite apart from the infinite, the other in which we realize how the infinite reveals itself in nature and in and to the spirit of man.

The first of these steps,—I may add to preclude a possible misunderstanding,—is independent of any particular idea of God. It does not involve Pantheism, unless it is Pantheism to say that there is no absolute reality in anything apart from the whole and its principle; nor does it involve any spiritual or personal conception of that principle; for that cannot be attained apart from a consideration of the whole process in which it is manifested. Obviously we can legitimately reach either of these views of God only by a consideration of the whole connexion of nature and spirit, and of the movement of evolution in which they manifest what *they* are, and what their principle therefore must be. What, so far, we have reached is only that there is such a unity, and that it is essentially self-revealing: and we can find *what* it is only from a consideration of the nature and method of its self-revelation; or, in other words, from the way in which we are obliged to think the world, when we think of it as a unity in all its being and process. For, as we think of the universe, we are obliged to think of its principle.

I may perhaps be asked whether this is Hegelianism? I would be inclined to answer that to say so would be to give Hegel, or any man, too much credit. It is rather the outcome of the whole idealistic movement of thought, and if it is to be attached to any name at all more than another, it would be to that of Plato. Hegel's philosophy is only the most persistent modern attempt to realize it in both its aspects; an attempt which has many obvious imperfections. Indeed, we may fairly say that such an attempt can never be completely successful, since the complete realization of it would mean nothing less than the consummation of philosophy. In Hegel's first work, *The Phaenomenology of Spirit*, he tried to show that it is impossible to stop short of the unity, the absolute unity of all things, in seeking their fundamental truth or reality. That book is a continuous refutation of one dualistic point of view after another, and its aim is—to state the matter concisely—to make us see that no distinctions are absolute. The result it aims at is a consciousness of the unity underlying all things in its simplest form, as the negation of all absolute distinctions. This view, or rather we should say, this point of view, Hegel always maintained to be the point of view essential to philosophy, and therefore it was that he said that 'to be a Spinozist was the beginning of true speculation.' 'The soul,' he declared, 'when it begins to philosophize, must first of all bathe in this pure ether of the one substance, in which all that it had previously held for true is submerged. This negation of all that is particular, to which every philosopher must have attained, is the liberation of the spirit and the absolute basis of its life.' In other words, as the effort of reason is essentially to see things from the centre and not from some point on the circumference; as, in Plato's language, its aim is necessarily to be a 'spectator of all time and existence'; philosophy, the purest expression of reason, must begin, like religion, by rising above the special forms of finite existence, and doing away with the conception that any of their differences is absolute. But this free ether in which all determination has for the moment dissipated itself is, Hegel maintains, just the atmosphere in which all forms of being will reappear in their due relation and process as moving towards each other and the whole. And philosophy is, therefore, just the attempt to describe the process of the finite without losing sight of the whole in the parts. It is the attempt to realize what was already sketched out by Plato as the development of all truth out of, or in consistency with, the idea of good, which is above the special determinations of being and knowing and is the source of them both.

We conclude, then, that the Anselmic argument for the being of God is the Scholastic distortion of an idea which was first presented in the Platonic philosophy, which was then hindered of its legitimate development, partly by the necessary imperfection of his knowledge of nature and history, and partly by the dualistic strain which was characteristic of ancient idealism; which reappeared in a more adequate form in the Christian doctrine of the λόγος, involving as it does, on the one hand, the conception of the self-revealing nature of God, and, on the other hand, the idea that the differences and defects, the contradictions and evils, of the finite are all relative and not absolute, and may ultimately be regarded as steps in the manifestation of the absolute good; and which, after it had been rejected in the inadequate form given to it by Anselm, re-emerged at the dawn of modern philosophy, and in the course of its development has found a new and more adequate interpretation. In this interpretation the argument is seen to be the converse of what it was first presented as being. It is not the proof of God from the thought of Him; but, starting with the presupposition that our minds are necessarily carried back to the consciousness of Him as the absolute unity to which all things must be referred, it is the proof that that unity must be conceived as a spiritual principle, not in the narrow sense in which that is sometimes opposed to a natural principle, but in the sense that only in spirit can the original unity return to itself through all the differences of the finite.

Another point may be added with reference to a view that has recently been maintained by some eminent writers, who follow Lotze in holding that, as our intelligence is discursive and not intuitive, the unity of all things is essentially beyond its grasp; and that therefore our knowledge must end in the recognition of a limit in itself, which at the same time it can transcend so far as to recognize that there *is* an absolute unity which it cannot further know. I cannot enter now upon the discussion of this view, which seems to me to involve a contradictory combination of belief and unbelief in the possibility of our knowing the Absolute. I shall content myself with indicating what I think the weakness of it. It seems to me to separate what in our thinking is never really separated, the intuitive and the discursive, or, as we might phrase it, the static and dynamic aspects of our intelligence. Our intelligence is always, as I conceive it, an *Anschauender Verstand*, discursive and intuitive at once: it always involves a discernment of distinctions and a movement by relation between the elements so distinguished; and always also, this movement has for its conscious or unconscious presupposition the unity of the whole within which the distinguished parts, things or beings, are contained. Hence if we talk of discursive or intuitive thought, we are talking not of what Spinoza calls *res completae*, of real independent entities, but of abstractions, of things that could not exist by themselves but only as elements in a whole; and indeed in the present case in a whole which has nothing beyond it from which it can be distinguished, or to which it can be related. Hence also the doctrine of Malebranche that 'we see all things in God' is capable of a true interpretation, and it is literally the fact that as rational beings we 'live and move and have our being' in God. Unfortunately such language is capable of being misunderstood, and, indeed,—when we take it in connexion with other views of the Cartesian school to which I have referred,—it directly leads to the Pantheistic conclusion that nothing is or is known but God, a God in whom the reality of the finite world is entirely lost. In this way the intuitive view of intelligence would be fatal to the discursive, as with Lotze the discursive is fatal to the intuitive view of it. But we cannot reduce our intelligence to either, without depriving it of its essential nature, and producing a contradiction as great as if we supposed absolute motion to exist without rest or absolute rest without motion in the material world. Our thought, by the very fact that it is the expression of the universal activity of intelligence, rests upon and presupposes the consciousness of the whole: it is thus *νοῦς*, reason, the intuition of the Absolute. But, on the other hand, as it always moves from finite to finite, from part to part, distinguishing and relating, it is equally *διάνοια*, understanding, the discourse of reason. And, though one of these aspects may be more prominent than the other in particular cases, it is impossible that they should ever be divided. To use a phrase borrowed from Kant, reason without understanding would be 'blind'; it would be a blank gaze at the whole as an undifferentiated unity, an immersion in the whole in which nothing particular could be distinguished, a mystic intuition of being in which thought had expired. And understanding without reason would be 'empty': it would be a futile play of ratiocination 'about it and about it,' a restless movement from part to part, without any insight into their real meaning or connexion as elements of one whole. It would be the formal inference of the Scholastic which, with all its process and activity, never gets any deeper into the subject it discusses. It is perhaps needless to say that no actual Mystic or Scholastic ever quite reaches the extreme to which they severally approximate.

E. CAIRD.

A PRACTICAL DISCOURSE ON SOME PRINCIPLES OF HYMN-SINGING.

WHAT St. Augustin says of the emotion which he felt on hearing the music in the Portian basilica at Milan in the year 386 has always seemed to me a good illustration of the relativity of musical expression; I mean how much more its ethical significance depends on the musical experience of the hearer, than on any special accomplishment or intrinsic development of the art. Knowing of what kind that music must have been and how few resources of expression it can have had,—being rudimental in form, without suggestion of harmony, and in its performance unskilful, its probably nasal voice-production unmodified by any accompaniment,—one marvels at his description,

> 'What tears I shed at Thy hymns and canticles, how acutely was my soul stirred by the voices and sweet music of Thy Church! As those voices entered my ears, truth distilled in my heart, and thence divine affection welled up in a flood, in tears o'erflowing, and happy was I in those tears[1].'

St Augustin appears to have witnessed the beginnings of the great music of the Western Church. It was the year of his baptism when, he tells us, singing was introduced at Milan to cheer the Catholics who had shut themselves up in the basilica with their bishop, to defend him from the imperial violence:

> 'It was then instituted that psalms and hymns should be sung, after the manner of the Eastern Churches, lest the folk in the weariness of their grief should altogether lose heart: and from that day to this the custom has been retained; many, nay, nearly all Thy flocks, in all regions of the world, following the example[2].'

What great emotional power St. Augustin attributed to ecclesiastical music, and of what importance he thought it, may be seen in the tenth book of the *Confessions*: he is there examining himself under the heads of the senses, and after the sense of smell, his chapter on the sense of hearing is as follows:—

---

[1] *Confess.* ix 6.

[2] *Ibid.* ix 7.

> 'The lust of the ears entangled and enslaved me more firmly, but Thou hast loosened and set me free. But even now I confess that I do yield a very little to the beauty of those sounds which are animated by Thy eloquence, when sung with a sweet and practised voice; not, indeed, so far that I am limed and cannot fly off at pleasure[1]: and yield though I do, yet these sweet sounds, joined with the divine words which are their life, cannot be admitted to my heart save to a place of some dignity, and I hesitate to give them one as lofty as their claim[2].
>
> For sometimes I seem to myself to be allowing them undue honour, when I feel that our minds are really moved to a warmer devotion and more ardent piety by the holy words themselves when they are so sung than when they are not so sung; and when I recognize that all the various moods of our spirit have their proper tones in speech and song, by which they are, through I know not what secret familiarity, excited. But the mere sensuous delight, to which it is not fitting to resign the mind to be enervated thereby, often deceives me, whenever (that is) the delight of the senses does not so accompany the reason as to be cheerfully in submission thereto, but, having been admitted only for reason's sake, then even attempts to go before and to lead. Thus I sin without knowing, but afterwards I know.
>
> Then awhile, from too immoderate caution against this deception, I err on the side of too great severity; and sometimes go so far as to wish that all the melody of the sweet chants which are used in the Davidian psalter were utterly banished from my ears, and from the ears of the Church; and that way seems to me safer which I remember often to have heard told of Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria, that he would have the lector of the psalm intone it with but a slight modulation of voice, so as to be more like one reading than one singing. And yet, when I remember my tears, which I shed at the hearing of the song of Thy Church in the first days of my recovered faith, and that now I still feel the same emotion, and am moved not by the singing but by what is sung, when it is sung with a liquid voice and in the most fitting "modulation," then (I say) I acknowledge again the great utility of the institution.
>
> Thus I fluctuate between the peril of sensuous pleasure and the proof

---

[1] This is perhaps rather a quality proper to the sensation.

[2] 'Et vix eis praebeo congruentem [locum],' which might only mean 'I cannot find the right place for them.'

of wholesomeness, and am more inclined (though I would not offer an irrevocable judgement) to approve of the use of singing in the Church, that, by the pleasure of the ear, weaker minds may rise to the emotion of piety. Yet when it happens to me to be more moved by the music than by the words that are sung I confess that I have sinned (poenaliter peccare), and it is then that I would rather not hear the singer[1].'

What would St. Augustin have said could he have heard Mozart's Requiem, or been present at some Roman Catholic cathedral where an eighteenth-century mass was performed, a woman hired from the Opera-House whooping the *Benedictus* from the western gallery?

It is possible that such music would not have had any ethical significance to him, bad or good. Augustin lived before what we reckon the very beginnings of modern music, with nothing to entice and delight his ears in the choir but the simplest ecclesiastical chant and hymn-tune sung in unison. We are accustomed to an almost over-elaborated art, which, having won powers of expression in all directions, has so squandered them that they are of little value: and we may confidently say that the emotional power of our church music is not so great as that described by him 1,500 years ago. In fact if we feel at all out of sympathy with Augustin's words, it is because he seems to over-estimate the danger of the emotion[2].

There is something very strange and surprising in this state of things, this contrast between the primitive Church with its few simple melodies that ravished the educated hearer, and our own full-blown institution with its hymn-book of some 600 tunes, which when it is opened fills the sensitive worshipper with dismay, so that there are persons who would rather not go inside a church than subject themselves to the trial.

What is the matter? What is it that is wrong with our hymnody? Even where there is not such rooted disgust as I have implied, there is a growing conviction that some reform is needed in words or music or both.

Assuming that the chief blame lies with the music (as, I think, might easily be proved), I propose to discuss the question of the music of our hymnody, and I shall proceed on the basis of St. Augustin's principles: I am sure that they would be endorsed by any pious church-goer who had considered the subject, and they may be fairly formulated thus, *The music must express the words or sense: it should not attract too much attention to itself: it should be dignified: and its reason and use is to heighten religious emotion.*

---

[1] *Confess.* x 33.

[2] St. Augustin does not allow that a vague emotion can be religious; it must be directed. Few would agree to this.

One point calls for distinction: Augustin speaks of his emotion on *hearing* the hymns and canticles; he writes as if he had had no more thought of taking part in the music himself, than we have of joining in the anthem at a cathedral; and this might lead to a misunderstanding; for there is no doubt that these hymns were sung by the people: the story is that the very soldiers who were sent to blockade the basilica, happening to be themselves catholics, joined their voices in the stanzas which St. Ambrose had specially composed to disconcert the Arian enemy.

The ecstasy of listening to music, and the enthusiasm of a crowd who are all singing or shouting the same hymn or song are emotions of quite different nature and value. Now, neglecting the rare conditions under which these emotions may be combined, we shall, as we are speaking of hymns, be concerned chiefly with the latter kind, for all will agree that hymns are that part of the Church music in which it is most desirable that the congregation should join: and I believe that there would be less difference in practice if it were at all easy to obtain good congregational singing, or even anything that is worthy of the name. It seems perhaps a pity that nature should have arranged that where the people are musical (as Augustin appears to have been) they would rather listen, and where they are unmusical they would all rather sing.

Speaking therefore of congregational hymn-singing, and conceding, as I think we must, that the essential use of such music is to heighten emotion, then, this emotional quality being the *sine qua non* (the music being of no use without it), it follows that it is the primary consideration. If we are to have music at all, it must be such as will raise or heighten emotion; and to define this we must ask, *Whose emotion?* and *What kind of emotion?*

Let us take this latter question first, and inquire what emotions it is usual, proper, or possible to express by congregational singing of hymns. William Law, in his *Serious Call,* has an interesting, I may say amusing, chapter on the duty of all to sing, whether they have any turn or inclination for it or no. All should sing, he says, even though they dislike doing so, and I think that what he affirms of private devotion applies with greater force to public worship. It should satisfy the most ardent advocate of congregational singing, and it goes certainly to the root of the matter.

> 'It is so right and beneficial to devotion, has so much effect upon our hearts, that it may be insisted on as a common rule for all persons . . . for singing is as much the proper use of a psalm as devout supplication is the proper use of a form of prayer: and a psalm only read is very much like a prayer that is only looked over. . . . If you were to tell a person that has such a song, that he need not sing it, that it was sufficient to peruse it, he would wonder what you meant, . . . as if you were to tell him that he should only look at his food, to see whether it was good, but need not eat it. . . . You will perhaps say that singing is a particular talent, that belongs only to particular people, and that you have neither voice nor ear for music.
>
> If you had said that singing is a general talent, and that people differ in that as they do in all other things, you had said something much truer.
>
> For how vastly people differ in the talent of thinking, which is not only common to all men, but seems to be the very essence of human nature: . . . Yet no one desires to be excused from thought because he has not this talent in any fine degree. . . .
>
> If a person were to forbear praying because he had an odd tone in his voice, he would have as good an excuse as he that forbears from singing psalms because he has but little management of his voice. . . .
>
> These songs make a sense (of) delight in God; they awaken holy devotion: they teach how to ask: they kindle a holy flame. . . .
>
> Singing is the natural effect of JOY in the heart . . . and it is also the natural means of raising EMOTIONS OF JOY in the mind: such JOY AND THANKFULNESS to God as is the highest perfection of a divine and holy life.'

Now though I cannot feel the force of all Law's arguments nor easily bring myself to believe that a person who dislikes singing, and has no ear for music, will readily find any comfortable assistance to his private devotion from making efforts to hit off the notes of the scale; yet I feel that Law's position is in the main sound, and that he has correctly specified the emotion most proper to that kind of uncultured singing which he describes: and though congregational psalm-singing necessarily involves a greater musical capacity than that assumed in Law's extreme case, and may therefore have a wider field, yet we may begin by laying down that JOY, PRAISE, and THANKSGIVING give us the first main head of what is proper to be expressed, and we may extend this head by adding ADORATION and perhaps the involved emotions of AWE and PEACE and even the attitude of CONTEMPLATION.

In such a subject as the classification of emotions as they may be expressed by music of one kind or another, it is plainly impossible to make any definite tabulation with which all would agree. The very names of the emotions will, to different minds, call up different associations of feeling. If any agreement could be arrived at, it would be at the expense of distinction; and all that I can expect is to have my distinctions understood, and in the main agreed with. And as I am most ready to grant to the reader his right to a different opinion on any detail, I beg of him the same toleration, and that he will rather try to follow my meaning than dwell on discrepancies which may be due to a fault of expression, or to a difference of meaning which he and I may attach to the same word.

With this apology in preamble, I will attempt to make some classification of emotions as they seem to me to be the possible basis for musical expression in congregational singing.

We have already one class: I would add a second, to include all the hymns which exhibit the simple attitude of PRAYER.

A third class I would put under the head of FAITH. Examples of this class will no doubt often cross with those of the first class, but they will specify themselves as CELEBRATIONS of events of various COMMEMORATION, introducing a distinct form, namely NARRATION, which is a very proper and effective form for general praise.

Also this section will include all the hymns of BROTHERHOOD and FELLOWSHIP, and of SPIRITUAL CONFLICT, with the correlative *invitatory* and *exhortatory* songs, as modified by what will be said later.

Also, lastly, under this same head of Faith, the DOCTRINAL hymns, and professions of creed whether sectarian or otherwise, which, if the definition be taken widely, make a large and popular class, well exemplified by the German hymns of the Reformation, or by those of our Wesleyan revival: strong with the united feeling of a small body, asserting itself in the face of opposition: concerning which we will not speak further, except to recall the fact that this kind of enthusiasm was not absent from the causes which first introduced hymns into the Western Church.

I believe that this is a pretty full list of all the attitudes of mind that can be properly expressed by congregational singing; and if we turn to other emotions which are made the subject of church hymns, we shall, I think, see that they are all of them liable to suffer damage by being entrusted to the rough handling of general vociferation.

Such will be all hymns of DIVINE AFFECTION and YEARNING; all LAMENTS and CONSOLATIONS; all descriptions of spiritual conditions which imply personal experience and feeling, as ABASEMENT, HUMILIATION, CONTRITION, REPENTANCE, RESIGNATION, SELF-DEVOTION, CONVICTION, and SATISFACTION.

Here I feel that many readers will be inclined to dissent from what I say, and as I shall not again recur to Law, I should like, in order to show my meaning, to call up his extreme example of an unmusical person singing in private devotion. If one pictures such a case as he supposes, is it not clear, whether one imagines oneself the actor or the unwilling auditor, that while such an exhibition of joy might perhaps pass, yet a similar incompetent attempt to express any of the last-named emotions would be only ridiculous? But between this single worshipper and the congregation the incompetence seems to me only a question of degree; while in the far more considerable respect of the sincerity of the feeling in the hearts of those expressing it, Law's singer has every advantage; indeed no objection on this score can be raised to him. But now suppose for a moment that he has *not* the emotion at heart corresponding to his attempt at song, and I think the differentiation of motives for congregational singing will seem justifiable.

All these last-named emotions,—which I have taken from congregational hymn-books,—and I suppose there may be more of them,—call for delicacy of treatment. A Lamentation, for instance, which might seem at first sight as if it would gain force by volume, will, if it is realistic or clumsy, become unmanly, almost so as to be ridiculous, and certainly depressing to the spirit rather than purifying. In fact while many of the subjects require beautiful expression, they are also more properly used when offered as inspiring ideals; and to assume them to be of common attainment or experience is to degrade them from their supreme sanctity. But in thus ruling them unfit for general singing one must distinguish large miscellaneous congregations from small united bodies, in which a more intimate emotion may be natural: and as there is no exact line of distinction here, so there is no objection to the occasional and partial intrusion of some of these more intimate subjects into congregational hymns.

To this first question then, as to what emotions are fit to be expressed by congregational music, the answer appears to be that the more general the singing, the more general and simple should be the emotion; and that the universally fitting themes are those of simple praise, prayer, or faith: and we might inquire whether one fault of our modern hymn-books may not be their attempt to supply congregational music to unfitting themes.

To the next question, *Whose emotion* is this congregational music to excite or heighten? the answer is plain: It is the average man, or one rather below the average, the uneducated, as St. Augustin says the weaker, mind; and that in England is, at least artistically, a narrow mind and a vulgar being. And it may of course be alleged that the music in our hymn-books which is intolerable to the more sensitive minds was not put there for them, but would justify itself in its supposed fitness for the lower classes. 'What use,' the pastor would say to one who, on the ground of tradition advocated the employment of the old plain-song and the Ambrosian melodies, 'What use to seek to attract such people as those in my cure with the ancient outlandish and stiff melodies that pleased folk a thousand years ago, and which I cannot pretend to like myself?' Or if his friend is a modern musician, who is urging him to have nothing in his church but what would satisfy the highest artistic sense of the day, his answer is the same: he will tell you that it would be casting pearls before swine; and that unless the music is 'tuney' and 'catchy' the people will not take to it. And we cannot hastily dismiss these practical objections. The very Ambrosian music which is now so strange to modern ears was doubtless, when St. Ambrose introduced it, much akin to the secular music of the day, if it was not directly borrowed from it: and the history of hymn-music is a history of the adaptations of profane successes in the art to the uses of the Church. Nor do I see that it can ever be otherwise, for the highest music demands a supernatural material; so that it would seem an equal folly for musicians to neglect the unique opportunity which religion offers them, and for religion to refuse the best productions of human art. And we must also remember that the art of the time, whether it be bad or good, has a much more living relation to the generation which is producing it, and exerts a more powerful influence upon it, than the art of any time that is past and gone. It is the same in all aspects of life: it is the book of the day, the hero or statesman of the hour, the newest hope, the latest flash of scientific light, which attracts the people. And it must be, on the face of it, true that any artist who becomes widely popular must have hit off, 'I know not by what secret familiarity,' the exact fashion or caprice of the current taste of his own generation.

And this is so true that it must be admitted that it is not always the uneducated man only whose taste is hit off. In the obituary notices of such men as Gladstone and Tennyson the gossip will inform us, rightly or wrongly, that their 'favourite hymn[1]' was, not one of the great masterpieces of the world,—which, alas, it is only too likely that in their long lives they never heard,—but some tune of the day: as if in the minds of men whose lives appealed strongly to their age there must be something delicately responsive to the exact ripple of the common taste and fashion of their generation.

All this makes a strong case: and it would seem, since our hymn-music is to stir the emotions of the vulgar, that it must itself be both vulgar and modern; and that, in the interest of the weaker mind, we must renounce all ancient tradition and the maxims of art, in order to be in touch with the music-halls.

---

[1] I assume 'favourite hymn' to mean a sung hymn. The interest of the record must lie in its being of a heightened emotion of the same kind as that described by St. Augustin in his own case, *What tears I shed*, &c.

This is impossibly absurd; and unless there is some flaw in our argument, the fault must lie in the premisses; we have omitted some necessary qualification.

The qualification which we neglected is this, that *the music must be dignified*, and suitable to the meaning; and we should only have wasted words in ignoring what we knew all along, if we had not, by so doing, brought this qualification into its vital prominence, and at the same time exposed the position of those who neglect it, and the real reason of the mean condition of our church music.

The use of undignified music for sacred purposes may perhaps be justified in exceptional cases, which must be left to the judgement of those who consider all things lawful that they may save some. But if from the mission service this licence should creep into the special service, and then invade every act of public worship, it must be met with an edict of unscrupulous exclusion. Not that it can be truly described as thus having crept in in our time. It is always creeping, it has flourished in special habitats for four or five hundred years, and before then there is the history of Palestrina's great reform of like abuses. If in our time in England we differ in any respect for the worse, it is rather in the universal prevalence of a mild form of the degradation, which is perhaps more degrading than the occasional exceptional abuses of a more flagrant kind, which cannot hide their scandal but bring their own condemnation.

There is indeed no extreme from which this abuse has shrunk; perhaps the worst form of it is the setting of sacred hymns to popular airs, which are associated in the minds of the singers with secular, or even comic and amatory words[1]: of which it is impossible to give examples, because the extreme instances are blasphemies unfit to be quoted; and it is only these which could convey an adequate idea of the licence[1]. The essence of the practice appears to be the production of a familiar excitement, with the intention of diverting it into a religious channel.

---

[1] It was not an uncommon practice on the Continent (say from 1540 to 1840), to print books of hymns to be sung to the current secular airs; and the names or first lines of these airs were set above the hymn-words as the musical direction. M. Douen, in his *Clément Marot et le psautier Huguenot*, vol. i, ch. 22, has given an account of some of these books; and any one who wishes to follow this branch of the subject may read his chapter. He does not notice the later Italian *Laude Spirituali*, which might have supplied incredible monsters to his museum.

But, even in the absence of secular or profane association, congregational singing, when provoked by undignified music, such as may be found in plenty in our modern hymn-books, may be maintained without the presence of religious feeling, out of mere high spirits, or as we say, 'in fun,' and may easily give rise to mockery. I have witnessed examples enough in proof of this, but if I gave them it might be thought that I wished to amuse profane readers[2]. And though such extreme disasters may be exceptional outbursts, yet they are always but just beneath the surface, and are the inevitable outcome of the use of unworthy means. The cause of such a choice of means must be either an artistic incapacity to distinguish, or a want of faith in the power of religious emotion when unaided by profane adjuncts. What would St. Augustin have ruled here, or thought of the confusion of ideas, which, being satisfied with any expression, mistakes one emotion for another?

[1] Besides, the main fault of these books, from which we should have to quote, is the *association* of the music, and this is really an accident, the question before us being the *character* of the music; so that we should require musical illustration, for though the common distinction between sacred and secular music is in the main just, yet the line cannot be drawn at the original intention, or historical origin of the music: the true differentiation lies in the character of the music, the associated sentiment being liable to change. If we were to banish from our hymn-books all the tunes which we know to have a secular origin, we should have to part with some of the most sacred and solemn compositions; and where would the purist obtain any assurance that the tunes which he retained had a better title? In the sixteenth century, when so many fine hymn-melodies were written, a musician was working in the approved manner if he adapted a secular melody, or at least borrowed a well-known opening phrase: and since the melodies of that time were composed mainly in conjunct movement, such initial similarities were unavoidable; for one may safely say that it very soon became impossible, under such restrictions, to invent a good opening phrase which had not been used before. The secular airs, too, of that time were often as fit for sacred as profane use; and if I had to find a worthy melody for a good new hymn, I should seek more hopefully among them than in the sacred music of our own century.

[2] I may give the following experience without offence. When I was an undergraduate there was a song from a comic opera by Offenbach so much in favour as to be *de rigueur* at festive meetings. Now there was at the same time a counterpart of this song popular at evensong in the churches: it was sung to 'Hark, hark, my soul.' I believe it is called *L'encens des fleurs*. They seemed to me both equally nauseating: it was certainly an accident that determined which should be sung at worship and which at wine.

The practical question now arises. We know the need; how is it to be supplied? We require music which will reach the emotions of uneducated people, and in which they will delight to join, and in which it shall be easy to join: and it must be dignified and not secular. If we condemn and reject the music which the professional church-musicians have supplied with some popular success to meet the need, what is there to take its place? Of what music is our hymn-book to be constructed, which shall be at once dignified, sacred, and popular?

The answer is very simple: it is this, *Dignified Melody*. Good melody is never out of fashion; and as it is by all confession the seal of high musical genius, so it is that form of music which is universally intelligible and in the best sense popular; and we have a rich legacy of it. What we want is that our hymn-books should contain a collection of the best ecclesiastical and sacred hymn-melodies, and *nothing but these*, instead of having but a modicum of these, for the most part mauled and illset, among a crowd of contributions of an altogether inferior kind; the whole collection being often such that if an illnatured critic were to assert that the compilers had degraded and limited the old music in order to set off their own, it would be difficult to meet him with a logical refutation.

The shortest and most practical way of treating this subject will be to give some account of the sources from which the music of such a hymn-book as I propose would be drawn. I will take these in their chronological order. First in order of time are the Plain-song melodies.

I have already stated the ordinary objection to these tunes, that they are stiff and out of date. Now it may be likely enough that they will never be so universally popular in our country as the fine melodies invented on the modern harmonic system, yet the idea that they are not popular in character, and that modern people will not sing them, is a mistake; there is plenty of evidence on this point. Nor must we judge them by the incompetent, and I confess somewhat revolting aspect in which they were offered to us by the Anglo-gregorianists of thirty years ago, a presentment which has gone far to ruin their reputation; they are better understood now, and may be heard here and there sung as they should be. They are of great artistic merit and beauty; and instead of considering them *a priori* as uncongenial on the ground of antiquity, we should rather be thinking of them that they were invented at a time when unison singing was cultivated in the highest perfection, so much so that a large number of these tunes are, on account of their elaborate and advanced rhythm, not only far above the most intelligent taste of the minds with which we have to deal, but are also so difficult of execution that there are few trained choirs in the country that could render them well. To the simpler tunes, however, these objections do not apply: in fact there are only two objections that can be urged against them, and both of these will be found on examination to be advantages.

The first objection is that they are not in the modern scale. Now as this objection is only felt by persons who have cramped their musical intelligence by an insufficient technical education, and cannot believe that music is music unless they are modulating in and out of some key by means of a sharp seventh;—and as the nature of the ecclesiastical modes is too long a subject, and too abstruse for a paper of this sort, even if I were competent to discuss it;—I shall therefore content myself by stating that the ecclesiastical modes have, for melodic purposes (which is all that we are considering), advantages over the modern scale, by which they are so surpassed in harmonic opportunities. Even such a thoroughgoing admirer of the modern system as Sir Hubert Parry writes on this subject, that it 'is now quite obvious that for melodic purposes such modes as the Doric and Phrygian were infinitely (*sic*) preferable to the Ionic,' i.e. to our modern major keys[1]. And it will be evident to every one how much music has of late years sought its charm in modal forms, under the guise of national character.

The second objection is their free rhythm. They are not written in barred time, and cannot without injury be reduced to it.

As this question affects also other classes of hymns, I will here say all that I have to say, or have space to say, about the rhythm of hymn-tunes; confining my remarks generally to the proper dignified rhythms.

In all modern musical grammars it is stated that there are virtually only two kinds of time. The time-beat goes either by twos or some multiple of two, or by threes or some multiple of three, and the accent recurs at regular intervals of time, and is marked by dividing off the music into bars of equal length. Nothing is more important for a beginner to learn, and yet from the point of view of rhythm nothing could be more inadequate. *Rhythm is infinite.* These regular times are no doubt the most important fundamental entities of it, and may even lie undiscoverably at the root of all varieties of rhythm whatsoever, and further they may be the only possible or permissible rhythms for a modern composer to use, but yet the absolute dominion which they now enjoy over all music lies rather in their practical necessity and convenience (since it is only by attending to them that the elaboration of modern harmonic music is possible), than in the undesirability (in itself) or unmusical character of melody which ignores them. In the matter of hymn-melodies an unbarred rhythm has very decided advantages over a barred rhythm. In the former the melody has its own way, and dances at liberty with the voice and sense; in barred time it has its accents squared out beforehand, and makes steadily for its predetermined beat, plumping down, as one may say, on the first note of every bar whether it will or no. Sing to any one a plain-song melody, *Ad coenam Agni* for instance, once or twice, and then Croft's 148th Psalm[1]. Croft will be undeniably fine and impressive, but he provokes a smile: his tune is like a diagram beside a flower.

---

[1] *The Art of Music*, by C. Hubert H. Parry. London, 1893, 1st edit., p. 48.

Now in this matter of rhythm our hymn-book compilers, since the seventeenth century, have done us all a vast injury. They have reduced all hymns to the common times. Their procedure was, I suppose, dictated by some argument such as this: 'The people must have what they can understand: they only understand the simple two and three time: *ergo* we must reduce all the tunes to these measures.' Or again, 'It will be easier for them to have all the tunes as much alike as possible: therefore let us make them all alike, and write them all in equal minims.'

Both these ideas are absolutely wrong. A hymn-tune, which they hastily assume to be the commonest and lowest form of music actually possesses liberties coveted by other music[1]. It is a short melody, committed to memory, and frequently repeated: there is no reason why it should submit to any of the time-conveniences of orchestral music: there is no reason why its rhythm should not be completely free; nor is there any *a priori* necessity why any one tune should be exactly alike another in rhythm. It will be learned by the ear (most often in childhood), be known and loved for its own sake, and blended in the heart with the words which interpret it: and this advantage was instinctively felt by those of our early church composers who, already understanding something of the value of barred music, yet deliberately avoided cramping the rhythms of their hymn-tunes by too great subservience to it[2]. One of the first duties therefore which we owe to hymn-melodies is the restoration of their free and original rhythms, keeping them as varied as possible: the Plain-song melodies must be left unbarred and be taught as free rhythms, and all other fine tunes which are worth using should be preserved in their original rhythm; because free rhythm is better, and its variety is good, and because the attraction of a hymn-melody lies in its individual character and expression, and not at all in its time-likeness to other tunes. This last idea has been a chief cause in the degradation of our hymns.

---

[1] And give Croft the advantage of his original rhythm, not the mis-statement in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 414.

I may conclude then that the best of these simpler Plain-song tunes are very fit for congregational use. They should be offered as pure melody in free rhythm and sung in unison: their accompaniment must not be entrusted to a modern grammarian. It is well also to use most of them in their English form, the *Old Sarum Use* as it is called; which happily preserves to us a national tradition, in the opinion of some experts older and more correct than any known on the continent; and if the differences in our English version are not due to purity of tradition, they will have another and almost greater interest, as venerable records of the genius of our national taste. These Plain-song tunes have probably a long future before them; since, apart from their merit, they are indissolubly associated with the most ancient Latin hymns, some of which are the very best hymns of the Church.

---

[1] It would be very damaging to my desire to convince, if I should seem to deny that the mistaken practice of these hymn-book compilers was based on the solid ground of secular common-sense. If anything is true of rhythm it is this, that the common mind likes common rhythms, such as the march or waltz, whereas elaboration of rhythm appeals to a trained mind or artistic faculty. I should say that the popularity of common rhythms is due to the shortness of human life, and that if men were to live to be 300 years old they would weary of the sort of music which Robert Browning describes so well—

'There's no keeping one's haunches still,
There's no such pleasure in life.'

But hymn-melodies must not be put on that level. It is desirable to have in church something different from what goes on outside, and (as I say in the text) a hymn-tune need not appeal to the lowest understanding on first hearing. The simple free rhythms, too, are perfectly natural; they were free-born.

[2] I need only instance Orlando Gibbons' tune called 'Angels.' The original is a most ingenious combination of rhythms; and its masterly beauty could not be guessed from the inane form into which it is degraded in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 8.

The next class of tunes[1] is that of the REFORMATION hymns, English, French, and German, dating from about 1550 to some way on in the seventeenth century. The chief English group is known as *Sternhold and Hopkins' Psalter*, which was mostly of eight-line tunes. This book was virtually put together in Geneva about 1560, and antiquarians make much of it. If stripped, however, of its stolen plumes and later additions it is really an almost worthless affair, the true history of it being as follows. A French musician named Louis Bourgeois, whom Calvin brought with him to Geneva in 1541, turned out to be an extraordinary genius in melody; he remained at Geneva about fifteen years, and in that time compiled a Psalter of eighty-five tunes, almost all of which are of great merit, and many of the very highest excellence. The splendour of his work, which was merely appreciated as useful at the time, was soon obscured, for immediately on his leaving Geneva, the French Psalter was completed by inferior hands, whose work, being mixed in with his, lowered the average of the whole book enormously, and Bourgeois' work was never distinguished until, quite lately, the period of his office was investigated and compared with the succeeding editions of his book. Now the English refugees compiled their 'Sternhold and Hopkins' at Geneva, in imitation of the French, during the time of Bourgeois' residence, and took over a number of the French tunes; though they *mauled these most unmercifully* to bring them down to the measure of their doggerel psalms, yet even after this barbarous treatment Bourgeois' spoilt tunes were still far better than what they made for themselves, and sufficient not only to float their book into credit, but to kindle the confused enthusiasm of subsequent English antiquarians, whose blind leadership has had some half-hearted following. But if these French tunes, and those which are pieced in imitation of Bourgeois, be abstracted from this English Psalter, then, with one or two exceptions, there will remain hardly anything of value[1].

---

[1] I omit, for want of space, mention of the late Plain-song melodies (which would give a good many excellent tunes); and for want of knowledge the Italian tunes.

To leave the English tunes for a moment and continue the subject, we shall practically exhaust the French branch of this class by saying that our duty by them is to use a great number of Bourgeois' tunes, *restoring their original form.* They are masterpieces which have remained popular on the continent from the first; thoroughly congenial to our national taste, and the best that can be imagined for solemn congregational singing of the kind which we might expect in England. The difficulty is the same that beset the old original psalter-makers, i.e. to find words to suit their varied measures. But this must be done[2]. These tunes in dignity, solemnity, pathos, and melodic solidity leave nothing to desire.

---

[1] Comparing the English with the French Genevan Psalter, I do not think my judgement is too severe on our own. It had a few fine tunes original to it; best of all the cxxxvii (degraded in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*). This is of such exceptional beauty that I believe it must have been written by Bourgeois for Whittingham. Next perhaps is lxxvii (called 81st in *H. A. M.*), the original of which, in Day, 1566, is a fine tune, degraded already in Este, 1592, which version *H. A. M.* follows: it is said to have come from Geneva. Besides these, xxv and xliv, which are the only other tunes from this source in *H. A. M.*, are very favourable examples, and I do not think that they will rescue the book. Nor can I believe that these old English D.C.M. tunes were ever much used. They are too much alike for many of them to have been committed to memory, while all the editions which I happen to have seen are full of misprints, and the four-line tunes which drove them out were early in the field, and increased rapidly.

[2] When one turns the pages of that most depressing of all books ever compiled by the groaning creature, Julian's hymn-dictionary, and sees the thousands of carefully tabulated English hymns, by far the greater number of them not only pitiable as efforts of human intelligence, but absolutely worthless as vocal material for melodic treatment, one wishes that all this effort had been directed to supply a real want. E.g. the two Wesleys between them wrote thirteen octavo volumes, of some 400 pages each, full of closely printed hymns. One must wish that Charles Wesley at least (who showed in a few instances how well he could do) had, instead of reeling off all this stuff, concentrated his efforts to produce only what should be worthy of his talents and useful to posterity.

The English eight-line tunes of Sternhold and Hopkins we may then, with one or two exceptions, dismiss to neglect; but among the four-line 'common' tunes which gradually ousted them, there are about a dozen of high merit: these being popular still at the present day require no notice, except to insist that they should be well harmonized in the manner of their time, and generally have the long initials and finals of all their lines observed. They are much finer than any one would guess from their usual dull presentment. Their manner, as loved and praised by Burns, is excellent, and there is no call to alter it[1].

Contemporary with this group there is a legacy of a dozen and more fine tunes composed by Tallis and Orlando Gibbons, the neglect or treatment of which is equally disgraceful to all concerned.

As for the German tunes of the Reformation, attempts to introduce the German church-chorales into anything like general use in England have never, so far as I know, been successful, owing, I suppose, to a difference in the melodic sense of the two nations. But some few of them are really popular, and more would be if they were properly presented with suitable words; and it should not be a difficult task to provide words even more suitable and kind than the original German, which seldom observes an intelligent, dignified and consistent mood. These chorales should be sung very slow indeed, and will admit of much accompaniment. Bach's settings, when not too elaborate or of impossible compass in the parts, may be well used where the choir is numerically strong. He has made these chorales peculiarly his own, and, in accepting his interpretation of them, we are only acquiescing in a universal judgement, while we make an exception in favour of genius; for as a general rule (which will of course apply to those chorales which we do not use in Bach's version), all the music of this Reformation period must be harmonized strictly in the vocal counterpoint which prevailed at the end of the sixteenth century; since that is not only its proper musical interpretation, but it is also the ecclesiastical style *par excellence*, the field of which may reasonably be extended, but by no means contracted. It is suitable both for simple and elaborate settings, for hymns of praise or of the more intimate ideal emotions, and in a resonant building a choir of six voices can produce complete effects with it. The broad, sonorous swell of its harmonious intervals floods the air with peaceful power, very unlike the broken sea of Bach's chromatics, which, to produce anything like an equal effect of sound, needs to be powerfully excited.

---

[1] If old tunes are modernized out of a fine rhythm, a curious result would be likely to come about; viz. that modern tunes might be written in the old rhythm for the sake of novelty, while the old were being sung in the more modern way for the sake of uniformity.

It is necessary to insist strongly on one caution, viz. that grammar is not style, and settings which avoid modernisms are not for that reason a fair presentation of the old manner. Nothing is less like a fine work of art than its incompetent imitation. And this practically exhausts, as far as I am aware, the material which this period provides.

The next class will be made up of our RESTORATION hymns, by Jeremy Clark, Croft, and others who added to the succeeding editions of the metrical Psalms. If there are not many in this class, yet the few are good ; and Clark must be regarded as the inventor of the modern English hymn-tune, regarded, that is, as a pure melody in the scale with harmonic interpretation of instrumental rather than true vocal suggestion. His tunes are pathetic, melodious, and of truly national and popular character, the best of them almost unaccountably free from the indefinable secular taint that such qualities are apt to introduce, and which the bad following of his example did very quickly introduce in the hands of less sensitive artists. They are suitable for evening services.

After this time there followed in England, in the wake of Handel, a degradation of style which is now completely discredited. Diatonic flow, with tediously orthodox modulation, overburdened with conventional graces, describe these innumerable and indistinguishable productions. And just as the old tunes were related to the motets and madrigals, so are these to the verse-anthems and glees of their time. These weak ditties, in the admired manner of Lord Mornington, were typically performed by the genteel pupils of the local musician, who, gathered round him beneath the laughing cherubs of the organ case, warbled by abundant candlelight to their respectful audience with a graceful execution that rivalled the weekday performances of *Celia's Arbour* and the *Spotted Snakes*. Good tunes may be written at any time, for style is independent of fashion ; but there are very few exceptions to the complete and unregretted disappearance of all the tunes of this date.

We have then nothing left for us to do but to review the material which the revival of music in the last fifty years has given us in the way of hymns.

This last group divides naturally into two main heads ; first the restoration of old hymns of all kinds, with their plain, severer manner, in reaction against the abused graces ; and secondly the appearance of a vast quantity of new hymns.

Concerning the restoration of the old hymns, we cannot be too grateful to those who pointed the right way, and, according to their knowledge and the opportunities of the taste of their day, did the best that they could. But, as our remarks under the heads of Plain-song and Reformation hymns will show, this knowledge, taste, and opportunity were insufficient, and all their work requires to be done afresh.

We are therefore left to the examination of the modern hymns. In place of this somewhat invidious task, I propose to make a few remarks on the general question of the introduction of modern harmony into ecclesiastical music, with reference of course to hymns only. It cannot escape the attention of any one that the modern church music has for one chief differentiation the profuse employment of pathetic chords, the effect of which is often disastrous to the feelings.

Comparing a modern hymn-tune in this style with some fine setting of an old tune in the diatonic ecclesiastical manner, one might attribute the superiority of the old music entirely to its harmonic system ; but I think this would be wrong.

It is a characteristic of all early art to be *impersonal*[1]. As long as an art is growing, artists are engaged in rivalry to develop the new inventions in a scientific manner, and individual personality is not called out. With the exhaustion of the means in the attainment of perfection a new stage is reached, in which individual expression is prominent, and seems to take the place of the scientific impersonal interest which aimed at nothing but beauty: so that the chief distinction between early and late art is that the former is impersonal, the latter personal.

---

[1] This fact is of course generally recognized. The explanation in the text is one which was elaborately illustrated by the Slade Professor at Oxford, in his last course of lectures on painting.

Turning now to the subject of ecclesiastical music, and comparing thus Palestrina with Beethoven or Mozart, is it not at once apparent that Palestrina has this distinct advantage, namely, that he seems not to interfere at all with, or add anything to, the sacred words? His early musical art is impersonal, what the musicians call 'pure music'; and if he is setting the phrases of the Liturgy or Holy Scriptures, we are not aware of any adjunct; it seems rather as if the sacred words had suddenly become musical. Not so with Mozart or Beethoven; we may prefer their music, but it has interfered with the sacred words, it has, in fact, added a personality.

It must of course be conceded that this gives a very strong if not logically an almost unassailable position to those who would confine sacred music to the ecclesiastical style. But it seems to me ridiculous to suppose that genius cannot use all good means with reserve and dignity; and if the modern church music will not stand comparison in respect of dignity and solemnity with the old, the fault must rather lie in the manner in which the new means are used, than in the means themselves; nor would I myself concede that there is no place in church for music which is tinged with a human personality; I should be rather inclined to reckon the great musicians among the prophets, and to sympathize with any one who might prefer the personality of Beethoven (as revealed in his works) to that of a good many canonized seers. What is logical is that we should be careful as to what personality we admit, and see that the modern means are used with reserve.

Now if we examine our modern hymn-tunes, do we find any sign of that reserve of means which we should expect of genius, or any style which we could attribute to the personality of a genius? Let any one in doubt try the following experiment: copy out some 'favourite tune' in the 'admired manner' of the present day, and show it to some musician who may happen not to know it, and ask him if it is not by Brahms; then see how he will receive any further remarks that you may make to him on the subject of music.

These new tunes are in fact, for the most part, the indistinguishable products of a school given over to certain mannerisms, and might be produced *ad libitum*, as indeed they are; just as were the tunes of the Lord Mornington school before described: and though the composers and compilers of these modern tunes would be the first to deride the exploded fashion, their own fashion is more foolish, and promises to be as fugitive[1].

I have said very little in this essay on the words of hymns. I will venture to add one or two judgements here. *First*, that in the Plain-song period, words and music seem pretty equal and well matched. *Secondly*, that in the Reformation period, and for some time onwards, the musicians did far better than the sacred poets, and have left us a remainder of admirable music, for which it is our duty to find words. *Thirdly*, that the excuse which some musicians have offered for the sentimentality of these modern tunes, namely, that the words are so sentimental, is not without point as a criticism of modern hymn-words, but is of no value whatever as a defence of their practice. The interpretative power of music is exceedingly great, and can force almost any words (as far as their sentiment is concerned) into a good channel.

And if music be introduced at all into public worship it must be most jealously and scrupulously guarded. It is a confusion of thought to suppose that because—as St. Augustin would tell us—it is not a vital matter to religion whether it employ music or not, therefore it can be of little consequence what sort of music is used: and the attitude of indifference towards it, which has seemed to me to be almost a point of correct ecclesiastical manners, must be the expression of a convinced despair, which, in the present state of things, need not surprise. Devout persons are naturally afraid of secular ideals, and shrink from the notion of art intruding into the sanctuary; and, especially if they have never learned music, they will share St. Augustin's jealousy of it; and it is the more difficult to remove their objections, when what they are innocently suffering in the name of art curdles the artist's blood with horror, and keeps him away from church. The artist too, to whom we might look for help, is the *rara avis in terris*, and, in regard to his sympathy with the clergy, would often be thought by them to deserve the rest of the hexameter ; but it is really to his credit that he is loth to meddle with church music. Its social vexations, its eye to the market, its truckling to vulgar taste and ready subservience to a dominant fashion, which can never (except under the rarest combination of circumstances) be good ;—all this is more than enough to hold him off. Where then is the appeal ? *Quis custodiet* ?

---

[1] There is one point which I cannot pass over. It has become the practice in modern books to put marks of musical expression to the words, directing the congregation when to sing loud or soft. This implies a habit of congregational performance the description of which would make a companion picture to the organ gallery of 1830. It seems to me a practice of inconceivable degradation: one asks in trembling if it is to be extended to the Psalms. It is just as if the congregation were school-children singing to please a musical inspector, and he a stupid one.

The unwillingness of the clergy[1] to know anything about music might be got over if the music could be set on a proper basis ; and in the present lack of authority and avowed principles, it would be well if such of our cathedral precentors and organists as have the matter at heart would consult and work together with the purpose of instructing pastors and people by the exhibition of what is good. This is what we might expect of our religious musical foundations, which are justifying the standing condemnation of utilitarian economists so long as the stipendiaries are content indolently to follow the fortuitous traditions of the books that lie in the choir, supplemented by the penny-a-sheet music of the common shops. In the Universities, too, it should be impossible for an undergraduate not to gain acquaintance with good ecclesiastical music, and this is not ensured by an occasional rare performance of half a dozen old masterpieces which are preserved in heartless compliment to antiquity. It is to such bodies that we must first look for help and guidance to give our church music artistic importance : for let no one think that the church can put the artistic question on one side. There is no escape from art ; art is only the best that man can do, and his second, third, fourth or fifth best are only worse efforts in the same direction, and in proportion as they fall short of the best the more plainly betray their artificiality. To refuse the best for the sake of something inferior of the same kind can never be a policy; it is rather an uncorrected bad habit, that can only be excused by ignorance; and ignorance on the question of music is every day becoming less excusable; and the growing interest and intelligence which all classes are now showing should force on religion a better appreciation of her most potent ally. Music being the universal expression of the mysterious and supernatural, the best that man has ever attained to, is capable of uniting in common devotion minds that are only separated by creeds, and it comforts our hope with a brighter promise of unity than any logic offers. And if we consider and ask ourselves what sort of music we should wish to hear on entering a church, we should surely, in describing our ideal, say first of all that it must be something different from what is heard elsewhere; that it should be a sacred music, devoted to its purpose, a music whose peace should still passion, whose dignity should strengthen our faith, whose unquestioned beauty should find a home in our hearts, to cheer us in life and death; a music worthy of the fair temples in which we meet, and of the holy words of our liturgy; a music whose expression of the mystery of things unseen never allowed any trifling motive to ruffle the sanctity of its reserve. What power for good such a music would have!

---

[1] It must be due to unwillingness that comparatively so few of our clergy can take their part in the service when it is musical. Village schoolmasters tell me that two hours a week is sufficient in a few months to bring all the children up to a standard of time and tune and reading at sight that would suffice a minor canon.

Now such a music our Church has got, and does not use; we are content to have our hymn-manuals stuffed with the sort of music which, merging the distinction between sacred and profane, seems designed to make the worldly man feel at home, rather than to reveal to him something of the life beyond his knowledge; compositions full of cheap emotional effects and bad experiments made to be cast aside, the works of the purveyors of marketable fashion, always pleased with themselves, and always to be derided by the succeeding generation [1].

ROBERT BRIDGES.

---

[1] Example is better than precept; and my own venture as a compiler of a hymn-book has made it possible for me to say much that otherwise I should not have said. In *The Yattendon Hymnal*, printed by Mr. Horace Hart at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, and to be had of Mr. Frowde, price 20s., will be found a hundred hymns with their music, chosen for a village choir. The music in this book will show what sort of a hymnal might be made on my principles, while the notes at the end of the volume will illustrate almost every point in this essay which requires illustration, besides many others. As I write, the last sheets of it are in the press, and the printer promises it in October.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

I. A CRITICISM OF LIGHTFOOT AND HEADLAM.

THE theological literature of England has recently been enriched by the addition of two important publications in the form of Dictionaries of the Bible, namely, a new edition of the first volume of Dr. William Smith's well-known work, first published by Messrs. Murray in 1863, and the first and second volumes of a new work, *A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its language, literature, and contents, including the Biblical Theology*, published by T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh, and edited by the Rev. Dr. James Hastings with the assistance of other scholars. It is not necessary to speak of the value of either of these works, or of their great practical utility. Both will be generally acknowledged. But we may perhaps be permitted to offer a few criticisms on the treatment of one important subject in these volumes.

The article on the Acts of the Apostles in the new edition of Smith's Dictionary is from the pen of the late Bishop Lightfoot, who on some points refers the reader to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.* The article on the same subject in Dr. Hastings' work is written by the Rev. Arthur Cayley Headlam, formerly Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Both of these are careful and elaborate articles by representative scholars, and it is interesting to note that, while the late Dean Alford's article on the Acts in the first issue of Smith's Dictionary was less than three columns in length, Bishop Lightfoot's article extends to more than thirty-seven columns, and that of Mr. Headlam to twenty. Of the variety of subjects dealt with in these articles I propose to examine only one, namely, that described by Mr. Headlam in the heading of section ix as 'The Historical Value of the Acts,' and discussed by Bishop Lightfoot under the heading of 'Authenticity and Genuineness.'

In inquiring into the historical value of the Book of Acts, the point which would seem first to attract attention is the character of the narrative in the early chapters of the book. The story of the Ascension in Acts differs materially not only from what we read on the same subject in the first Gospel, but also from the writer's own statement in the third Gospel. It is impossible to deny the existence of this contradiction. The statement in the Acts is quite clear. And if any doubt existed as to the interpretation of the concluding verses of St. Luke's Gospel it would be removed by a comparison with the appendix to St. Mark. In fact we nowhere hear of the forty days in Jerusalem until we come to the Book of Acts[1].

The doubt about the forty days of necessity extends to other events in the early history of the Church in Jerusalem, to the election of Matthias, the occurrences on the Day of Pentecost, Peter's speech, the numerical growth of the Church, and so on. On the subject of the speaking with tongues on the Day of Pentecost the opponents of the historical character of these early chapters lay special emphasis, because of the contrast between the account given in Acts ii 1–11 and what we read in St. Paul's Epistles about the gift of tongues in the Corinthian Church. It is a disappointment to find that neither the question of the forty days nor that of the speaking with tongues is mentioned in either of the Dictionary articles; unless we are to suppose that there is a reference to them intended in Mr. Headlam's statement (p. 35 *a*) that 'for the previous period [that is, the part of the history contained in the early chapters of the Book of Acts] he [St. Luke] could not in all cases attain the same degree of accuracy' as in the later chapters, and especially in the part covered by the 'We' sections. But to this Mr. Headlam immediately and somewhat perplexingly adds, 'Yet he was personally acquainted with eye-witnesses throughout, and may probably have had one or more written documents' (ibid.). If we are to suppose that St. Luke had the testimony of eye-witnesses for his account of the Ascension and the speaking with tongues, some explanation ought to be offered of his disagreement with the other Evangelists, and with St. Paul, and with his own former treatise.

---

[1] See Matt. xxviii 16–20, Luke xxiv 36–53, Mark xvi, John xxi, and 1 Cor. xv 6 (compare Acts i 15). The recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of St. Peter affords additional proof, if such were needed, of the existence in the Church of a tradition according to which the disciples left Jerusalem after the Resurrection instead of waiting for the Day of Pentecost, as the Acts relates. The Church, however, seems to have early adopted the Jerusalem tradition, as is shown by the early observance of the Christian Pentecost (see Smith's *Dict. C. A.*, art. 'Pentecost').

It will add to the questions raised by these early chapters of the Acts if we accept a conclusion at which Professor Stanton arrives in his article on the Gospels in the second volume of Hastings' Dictionary. He gives the preference to the Johannine tradition of the life of Christ as compared with that of the Synoptics, an opinion for which there is much to be said, and he thinks that the fragmentariness of the Synoptics must be due to the limited character of the material that had come to their hand. 'But,' he adds, 'in order to explain the phenomena now before us—the contrast between the Synoptic and the Johannine accounts—it seems necessary to suppose further that the knowledge embodied in the latter had, at the time when the first three Gospels were composed, been delivered only within a comparatively limited circle' (p. 247). If this were so, it would make it hard to accept all that is implied in St. Luke's account of the appointment of Matthias, for if there was a college of men at Jerusalem specially qualified to deliver the correct tradition of the ministry of Jesus, how did it happen that Luke himself did not know the true story, but accepted the imperfect Synoptic tradition? And what are we to think of his claim to have 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first'?

Passing over the variations which are found to exist between the different forms of the story of the conversion of St. Paul, which are of little importance in themselves, though they show that the writer cannot be trusted for strict accuracy, we come to the alleged contradictions between the narrative of the Acts and St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. These concern St. Paul's visits to Jerusalem, the relation between St. Paul and the older Apostles, and the attitude of the Church in Jerusalem towards the Gentile Christians.

On the subject of St. Paul's visits to Jerusalem and his relation to the Church there, the impression produced by the Book of the Acts is distinctly different from that which we derive from St. Paul's own statements on the subject in the Epistle to the Galatians. According to the Acts St. Paul returned from Damascus to Jerusalem soon after his conversion. At Jerusalem he was introduced to the Apostles by Barnabas, and 'was with them, going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord,' until he was compelled to depart by the threatening attitude of the Grecian Jews (Acts ix 19–31). After this we read of two official visits to Jerusalem—first, when he was sent with Barnabas from the Church at Antioch to carry relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judaea (Acts xi 27–30, xii 25); and, secondly, when he and Barnabas were again sent from the same Church to the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv 1–31). A later passage in the Acts puts in St. Paul's mouth the declaration that on his conversion he 'declared both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judaea, and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance' (Acts xxvi 20).

This representation of the Apostle's relations with the Church in Jerusalem after his conversion differs materially from what we read in Galatians (Gal. i 15–ii 2), that St. Paul did not return to Jerusalem until three years after his conversion, having in the meantime gone into Arabia; that when he did go to Jerusalem he went only to visit Cephas, and stayed with him fifteen days, seeing no other of the Apostles except James the Lord's brother; and that then and afterwards he was unknown by face to the churches of Judaea, being known to them only by report as a convert to Christianity. Then fourteen years later he went up again to Jerusalem 'by revelation,' and laid before them the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, 'but privately before them who were of repute.'

Lightfoot endeavours to get over the difficulty about the time of the first visit by supposing that the 'days' which St. Paul spent in Damascus, according to the narrative in the Acts, might cover the three years mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians[1].

---

[1] 'Certain days' (*ἡμέρας τινάς*), Acts ix 19; and 'many days' (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*), ix 23.

This, however, is not likely. It is opposed to what appears to be the obvious intention of the writer of Acts, who tells us that when St. Paul came to Jerusalem the members of the Church could not believe the story of his conversion, and implies that the Apostles had not heard about it until they were told of it by Barnabas. This does not look as if three years had elapsed since St. Paul had commenced to preach Christ in Damascus.

The same interpretation of the narrative is confirmed by the concluding words (Acts ix 31):—'So the Church throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, being edified; and, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, was multiplied.' These words seem intended to connect the cessation of the persecution with the event on the road to Damascus, and, if so, they do not leave room for an interval of three years.

Mr. Headlam takes safer ground than Bishop Lightfoot when he acknowledges that 'the obvious impression created by the narrative is that the writer [of the Acts] did not know of the Arabian journey, nor of the length of time which had elapsed before the Jerusalem visit,' and that 'the two narratives give a somewhat different impression.'

The difference between the two narratives is accentuated when we remember the Apostle's saying in his Epistle to the Galatians that he was 'unknown by face unto the churches of Judaea.' It is not sufficient to answer to this with Bishop Lightfoot, that 'to a majority of the Christians at Jerusalem he *might*, and to the churches of Judaea at large he *must*, have been personally unknown' (*Galatians*, p. 92)[1], especially when we remember the words put into St. Paul's mouth in Acts xxvi 20, that he had preached 'first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judaea'; although it must be acknowledged that this statement is as hard to reconcile with the rest of the Book of Acts as it is with the Epistle to the Galatians.

The difficulty about the second visit recorded in the Acts is that St. Paul's statement in Galatians appears to leave no room for it. Lightfoot's solution is that when St. Paul went to

---

[1] In 1 Thess. ii 14 the phrase 'the churches of God which are in Judaea' does not seem intended to exclude Jerusalem. Comp. Rom. xv 31 and 2 Cor. i 16.

Jerusalem the Apostles were not there, having fled from the city to avoid the persecution under Herod Agrippa I (Acts xii 1–19), and that therefore he did not mention the visit, because his object was not to enumerate his journeys to Jerusalem, but to define his relations with the Twelve (*Galatians*, p. 126). But St. Paul does more than omit the mention of the visit. He says that he 'was unknown by face to the churches of Judaea.' Mr. Headlam seems undecided about this second visit. He speaks of it as 'a genuine difficulty,' but he quotes Lightfoot's solution with approval, and speaks of it as receiving the support of Dr. Hort.

It seems to be pretty generally agreed, in spite of Professor Ramsay's recently expressed opinion to the contrary, that the third journey to Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv, is to be identified with the second of the two which are mentioned in Galatians. If so, the first point of divergence that strikes us is that the account given in the Acts of St. Paul's mission from the Church of Antioch, and of his public reception by the whole Church in Jerusalem, is not consistent with his own words, that he went up by revelation to lay 'privately before them who were of repute' a statement of the work which he had been doing amongst the Gentiles. It is quite possible that, as Bishop Lightfoot urges, he may have gone up to Jerusalem by revelation, and also have been sent with a public commission from the Church of Antioch; and it is also quite possible that both of the accounts, that in the Acts and that in the Galatians, may have related to a visit at which both a private interview with the heads of the Church and a public conference of the whole Church took place. But it must be admitted that each of the narratives as they now stand excludes the other. St. Paul says that when he went up to Jerusalem he laid his statement privately before the leaders, and the whole drift of his argument implies that there was nothing more than this private conference. Or else what does he gain by saying that it was private? On the other hand, the Acts relates the public council and the results that followed, but knows nothing of a private meeting. The contradiction in itself may not be of much, or of any, importance, but it implies of necessity that we cannot regard both accounts as accurate. It may be that, as Bishop Lightfoot says, each narrative represents a different aspect of the same event. But each represents it in such a way as to exclude the other.

Bishop Lightfoot cites Acts xv 4, 5, 6 as showing that 'St. Luke alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress' (p. 125), one of which may have been the private meeting. But the first conference recorded in these verses was not a private meeting. It was the public reception of the envoys from Antioch by the whole Church in Jerusalem. Then followed the objections of the Pharisee converts, made most likely at the reception, though possibly afterwards; and then the public meeting to consider the questions raised. There is no hint of any private conference with the heads of the Church.

The difference between the Apostolic decree in Acts xv and St. Paul's statement in Galatians (ii 1–10) of the terms of the agreement come to between him and the older Apostles, and the inconsistency of the former with St. Paul's habitual teaching as to the complete freedom of Christians from the law of Moses, are serious difficulties in the way of the reconciliation of the Acts with the Pauline Epistles. It is not easy to be satisfied with Bishop Lightfoot's explanation, that 'the Apostolic letter was only addressed to the Gentile brethren "in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia" (xv 23), that is, to the churches more directly in communication with Palestine, and therefore materially affected by the state of feeling and practice among the Jewish Christians,' and that 'there is no reason for supposing that the decree was intended to be permanent and universal' (*Galatians*, p. 126). When Paul and Silas set out upon their next missionary journey, we are told that 'as they went on their way through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the Apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem' (Acts xvi 4), and this after they had travelled beyond the limits of Syria and Cilicia. This shows that the operation of the decree was not intended to be limited to those to whom it was formally addressed. It was addressed to them apparently because it was an answer to the question which they had asked[1]. There is no hint in the Acts of any intended limitation of the application of its principles either in time or place. On the contrary, a long time after these events, when St. Paul's missionary labours had extended as far as to Macedonia and Greece, the heads of the Church in Jerusalem are represented as speaking of the decree as still in force, and without giving a hint that it was not of universal application (Acts xxi 25).

---

[1] Acts xv 1–3. Antioch, the capital of Syria, was close to the borders of Cilicia. Compare Acts xi 25, 26. See also Gal. i 21.

Mr. Headlam makes light of the difficulty connected with the 'dissembling' of Peter (Gal. ii 11–21). 'It is merely,' he says, 'that St. Luke does not record a narrative concerning St. Peter mentioned by St. Paul.' Lightfoot shows more appreciation of the point. He says, 'The conduct of St. Peter at Antioch has been a great stumbling-block both in ancient and modern times. It has been thought strange that the very Apostle to whom was vouchsafed the revelation that there is nothing common or unclean, and who only a short time before this meeting at Antioch had declared himself plainly in favour of Gentile liberty, should have acted in a manner so inconsistent with all that had gone before' (*Galatians*, p. 127). He finds the explanation in Peter's well-known character:—'It is no surprise that he who at one moment declared himself ready to lay down his life for his Lord's sake, and even drew his sword in defence of his Master, and the next betrayed him with a thrice-repeated denial, should have acted in this case as we inferred he acted from the combined accounts of St. Luke and St. Paul' (p. 128). This explanation might be more satisfactory if the only difficulty was the impulsiveness of Peter. The action attributed to James is equally strange after all that had occurred in the Jewish Church (Acts x 1–xi 18, xv 1–29)[1].

There is another passage which deserves notice when we compare the Pauline Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles, but which receives no attention from either Bishop Lightfoot or Mr. Headlam, namely, that in which the Apostle of the Gentiles enumerates the sufferings which he endured as a minister of Christ (2 Cor. xi 23–33). Of the Jews he five times received forty stripes save one. Thrice was he beaten with rods (by the Roman authorities). Thrice he suffered shipwreck. A night and a day had he been in the deep. If these details are to be trusted—and they are stated with great exactness—it follows that the Book of the Acts presents a very incomplete picture of the missionary labours and sufferings of St. Paul. It is certain either that the writer had but a very meagre knowledge of his subject, or else that he selected only such materials as suited his purpose, whatever it may have been, and that in either case he gave his narrative an appearance of completeness which it did not really possess[1].

---

[1] In support of the Acts narrative Mr. Headlam quotes Harnack that 'it is clear from Gal. ii 11 ff. that Peter then and for long before accepted in principle the standpoint of Paul' (*Hist. of Dogma*, p. 90, note; see also Weizsäcker, *Apost. Age*, p. 75. Both in Eng. tr.); that is, 'that a man is not justified by the works of the law, save through (or, but only through, Marg.) faith in Jesus Christ.' But though this may be true, it would still leave a difficulty in reconciling St. Paul's statement in Gal. ii 11–14 with Acts x, xi 1–18, and xv 6–11, 13–21.

The three sentences which Mr. Headlam devotes to the miracles in the Acts are not very clear. He says:—'To say that the document is unhistorical because it relates miracles, or because it contains accounts of angels, is simply to beg the question. Even if we were quite certain that such events were impossible and never occurred, we have abundant evidence for knowing that the early Christians believed in them. St. Paul claims himself to have worked what were believed both by himself and his readers to be miracles' (p. 31 *a*). The fact that the early Christians believed in miracles would be evidence of the good faith of the writer who recorded them, but it would not, of itself, prove the historical value of a composition in which 'impossible' narratives occurred. Mr. Headlam does not mention the fact that some of the miraculous narratives in the Acts, such as the healings of the people by Peter's shadow (v 15, 16), or by the handkerchiefs or aprons from Paul's body (xix 12), or the details of the deliverance from the prison in Philippi (xvi 19–40), are felt to be difficulties even by persons who do not disbelieve in miracles generally.

Bishop Lightfoot has a paragraph on the minor discrepancies and errors, real or supposed, in the Book of Acts[2]. There is a very considerable number of these, and they ought certainly to be taken into consideration in estimating the historical accuracy of the book. Lightfoot's method of dealing with them illustrates in a striking way the position which he takes up with regard to the criticisms which modern scholars have passed upon the book. Some of them occur in the speeches, or in other compositions which he supposes the author to have incorporated in his work, as, for example, the three different accounts of the conversion of St. Paul. He claims therefore that the errors, if errors there be, are the fault of the speakers whose speeches are reported, or of the other original sources which the writer used, and not of the author of the Acts. Instead of being an argument against the historical character of the Book of Acts, the apparent errors thus become an additional proof of its accuracy, because they show the care with which the author reproduced his materials just as he found them, without making any correction or emendation[1]. Lightfoot holds that, considering the common use of shorthand amongst the ancients, there is no improbability in the supposition that the speeches were reproduced from written notes taken down at the time, and that this is the most reasonable account that can be given of their appearance in the Acts. On all which we may remark that, without entering into any inquiry as to how far shorthand was in use in the first century for the purpose of reporting speeches, it is very unlikely that any accurate reports would have been preserved of a number of speeches separated so widely in the time, place, and circumstances of their delivery as those that are brought together in the Book of Acts; that it seems to be generally acknowledged that the similarity of style pervading the whole book shows that, whatever the original materials may have been, the author of the Acts did not insert them in his work without alteration; and, lastly, that our study of the book in other particulars does not favour this

---

[1] Writing in defence of St. Luke, Professor Ramsay says that 'true historical genius lies in selecting,' and that 'the historian may dismiss years with a word' (*St. Paul*, p. 7). But the difficulty with St. Luke is that he dismisses them without a word, without a hint that he knew of their existence, or even with words that imply the contrary.

[2] Compare Acts i 4 with Matt. xxviii 9, 10; Acts i 15 with 1 Cor. xv 6; Acts i 18, 19 with Matt. xxvii 3–8, and see Alford; Acts v 36 with Jos. *Antt.* xx 5. 1, and see Alford; Acts vii 4 with Gen. xi 26, 32, and xii 4 (see Alford);

Acts vii 14 with Deut. x 22 (see Alford); Acts vii 15, 16 with Gen. xlix 29–33, l 26, Exod. xiii 19, Josh. xxiv 32; also with Gen. xxiii 3–20, xxxiii 18–20; Acts vii 43 with Amos v 27; Acts vii 57, 58 with John xviii 31; Acts ix 3–22 with xxii 6–21, xxvi 12–20; ix 7 with xxii 9; ix 29, 30 with xxii 17–21; Acts x 28 with Alford's note; Acts xxvi 20 with Gal. i 22.

[1] 'We have also another indication of genuineness in the minor discrepancies and errors, or what appear to be such,' Smith's Dict., p. 34 *a*.

notion of such minute accuracy on the part of the writer as is implied in Bishop Lightfoot's view.

On the subject of the speeches Mr. Headlam is less conservative than Lightfoot. He says, 'They are all very short, too short to have been delivered as they stand, and for the most part the style in which they are written is that of the historian. They are clearly, therefore, in a sense his own compositions' (p. 33 *b*). 'The presence of the author's hand in the speeches cannot be denied. Their literary form is due to him. He may possibly have summed up in a typical speech the characteristics of St. Paul's preaching before certain classes of hearers. Some details or illustrations may be due to him, such as the mention of Theudas in Gamaliel's speech, or that of Judas in Peter's first speech. But no theory which does not admit the possession of good evidence, and the acquaintance of the author with the events and persons that he is describing, is consistent with the phenomena of the speeches. They are too lifelike, real, varied, and adapted to their circumstances to be mere unsubstantial rhetorical exercises' (p. 34 *a*)[1].

We have seen that in other points, as well as in the case of the speeches, Mr. Headlam is prepared to go further than Bishop Lightfoot in accepting the results of criticism. But, while we gladly recognize the many excellencies of both of these articles, it will be evident, without adding to these notes, that neither of them can be accepted as fully meeting the objections which have been made to the accuracy of the author of the Acts as an historical writer.

Though the writer of the Acts may not be a model of accuracy, or may not have understood the art of writing history as we understand it now, his work will still remain our most valuable source of information for the history of the Apostolic age. But if we are to gain from such a book all the information which it contains, it is necessary that we should first form, by perfectly independent investigation, a correct idea of its historical character and value. No one person can do this completely, whatever his ability or knowledge may be, for we are all, even the greatest of us, subject to bias and prepossession in one direction or another. But we may hope that, by the united labours of all, the truth will be reached in the end.

---

[1] In connexion with the speeches it may be worth observing that it is in accordance with the manner of the writer of the Acts to let his characters speak for themselves, instead of telling us in his own words what they said. 'The employment of the indirect form of speech, whether with ὅτι and the optative, or with the accusative (nomin.) and infinitive, is not in the manner of the N.T. writers of narrative, as it is foreign to the style of popular narrators in general.' Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, § 79. 12.

J. A. CROSS.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

II. A PLEA FOR AN EARLY DATE.

THE present paper confines itself strictly to one point in regard to the book of the Acts of the Apostles, namely, the date of its composition[1]. If the date here proposed be established, our attitude towards many of the questions that may be or have been raised about the book will be radically altered. Possibilities which must be kept open, or at least faced and considered, if the Acts was written after A.D. 70, can be safely set aside if it be once shown that it should rather be dated before the death of St. Paul, or, to speak more precisely, at about the end of the two years' imprisonment at Rome mentioned in Acts xxviii 30.

This is of course not the date adopted by the great majority even of those critics who accept the Lucan authorship of the Acts[2]. Bishop Lightfoot, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*—and, somewhat more doubtfully, Mr. Headlam in Hastings' *Dictionary*—incline to a date after the destruction of Jerusalem. Dr. Sanday speaks of 'circa 80 A.D.'[3], and this appears to be also Prof. Ramsay's view. I shall speak later on of the argument from the Gospel that has probably appeared decisive to some at least of these critics, and rather begin by enumerating what seem to me to be the difficulties attaching to any date as late as A.D. 70, since it is on these that the case for the earlier date mainly rests.

I. The crucial difficulty is the silence of the Acts as to St. Paul's martyrdom: and it is a difficulty which confronts us from more than one point of view.

---

[1] Since not everything can be proved in the compass of a single short article, the Lucan authorship is assumed, though, as a matter of fact, many of the arguments would not be affected if the reader were to substitute 'the author of the Acts' for each mention of St. Luke.

[2] Exceptions, however, are Salmon, *Introd. to the N. T.*, ed. 1 p. 390, and Blass, *Acta apostolorum*, pp. 3–5.

[3] *Inspiration*, p. 449.

First then in regard to the structure of the Acts as a whole. It has become a commonplace to say that the book shows that its author had an artist's conception as well as an artist's hand, that it is composed on a definite plan with definite aim and definite progress to its end. And on the one view of the date this conception and development is indeed perfectly clear, obvious, and intelligible: but on the other the Acts would only resemble a building out of proportion, badly constructed, and inexplicable. For in investigating the principles of the building we find it is constructed on a framework of the law of Christian life. This law is learnt in the Gospel, and upon it is based the scheme both of the Gospel and the Acts. In both we have an Introduction or Preparation: then an outpouring of the Holy Spirit: this is followed by the body of the work, the active Ministry. This ministry is concluded by a Passion, which is early anticipated[1], and is narrated at great length: but the Passion is followed by a Resurrection or Deliverance[2]. In all this the Acts corresponds to the Gospel as a whole, but at the same time falls itself into two parts—the Acts of St. Peter (i–xii) and the Acts of St. Paul (xiii–xxviii): and, without interfering with the general scheme, each of these is modelled upon the same idea: Preparation (ch. i; and for Part II ch. xii, cf. xi 27–30 and xii 25): Manifestation of the Spirit (ii 1–13; xiii 1–4): Work (ii 14—xi 26; xiii 4—xix 20): Passion and Deliverance (xii; and xix 21—xxviii). At the end of the first part we have the martyrdom of St. James, but in St. Peter's case an imminent death followed by sudden deliverance. Similarly in St. Paul's case the actual death is wanting, but St. Luke gives what had (at our supposed date of writing) most nearly corresponded to the Lord's Passion—his bondage at Jerusalem, his delivery into the hands of the Gentiles, and the 'going down to the deep' (like Jonah) in the shipwreck. After this escape there is no anticipation of death, but rather an air of optimistic confidence: his light custody and freedom of work at Rome are, as it were, a restoration of life after death.

Now if St. Luke wrote before the death of St. Paul, all this is intelligible and the comparison holds good. But if he wrote after the death of the Apostles the state of the case is entirely altered. He has not only missed in the Acts the obvious parallel to the Passion of the Gospels, but also made it hard for us to discover any plan at the bottom of his narrative. We should be wholly at a loss to understand the reason for the great length and detail of chapters xx–xxviii in relation to the rest of the work. What would be intelligible enough (on almost any theory of the plan of the book) if the author were writing immediately after the conclusion of the period described—since it is always natural for recent events to loom large upon the view—is unintelligible in the case of a retrospect several years later, at a time when St. Paul's arrest and trial at Jerusalem ought surely to have fallen into a subordinate place. St. Luke then, if writing after St. Paul's death, has undoubtedly been guilty of making a false climax: even Prof. Ramsay has to admit that 'the plan of the Acts has been obscured by the want of the proper climax and conclusion[1].' But with the evidence of St. Luke's literary power supplied by the Acts itself, we cannot believe that he would have been guilty of such an error in his main conception or have produced so disproportionate a work.

---

[1] Cf. Acts xix 21, and Luc. ix 51.

[2] Acts xxviii roughly corresponds to Luc. xxiv, and more definitely Acts xxviii 30, 31, with Luc. xxiv 52, 53.

Secondly, there is what we may call the personal point of view.

In the second part of the Acts (ch. xiii–xxviii) St. Paul is the central figure. St. Luke is obviously devoted to him personally, and leads us in his footsteps with an ever increasing interest. From the twentieth chapter (more particularly from xix 21) matters have been working up to a crisis. St. Paul is arrested; we are taken minutely through the first stages of his trial; the end is at hand, his doom is to be decided—and the story suddenly breaks off. What was the fate of St. Paul? There is not a word to say. The martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul must have been to Christians all the world over among the most exciting events of the Church's history: yet St. Luke, writing at or for Rome, keeps silence. There is not only no description of the martyrdom—I shall speak later on of the hypothesis that the account of this was to have followed in a third volume—but there is not even a single anticipatory hint or allusion to the fate of St. Paul. And this is all the more remarkable, because an air of sorrowful presentiment does hang over the last journey to

---

[1] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 23.

Jerusalem[1]. But presentiment of what? Not of death at all, but of 'bonds and imprisonment' awaiting the Apostle. No doubt St. Paul's arrest at Jerusalem and delivery 'into the hands of the Gentiles' (xxi 11) was a crisis in his life. Yet how much the anticipation of a martyr's death would have heightened the pathos and force of the narrative[2].

This absence of allusion is especially surprising as we realize the dramatic power of St. Luke. Tradition made him a painter, and certainly he had the painter's power in sketching a vivid scene by a few dramatic touches. His eye is wide open to the significance of details or incidents. He likes to indicate contrasts: the liberality of Joseph Barnabas and the covetousness of Ananias and Sapphira, the deliverance of Peter and the judgement of Herod, are placed side by side. 'The young man Saul' is introduced into the scene of St. Stephen's martyrdom; the historian traces the doctrine of retribution at work in subsequent events, and the words he uses of St. Paul's sufferings continually remind us of the measure dealt by Saul to Stephen. What a complete fulfilment of the doctrine would have been given by the shedding of St. Paul's own blood!

The real difficulty here proved is the absence not so much of deliberate statement as of incidental and, as it were, unintentional allusions. We should have a parallel case if a devoted cavalier and personal attendant of King Charles I, writing about A.D. 1660 a history of the Great Rebellion, should have stopped short at A.D. 1647 without having let drop a hint or a word to suggest the ultimate fate of the king.

II. A similar chain of reasoning will make it probable that the Acts was composed before the end of St. Paul's first Roman imprisonment, if, as we believe, that ended in a trial and acquittal[3]. Just as to have stopped short of the martyrdom would have obscured the main conception of the book, so to have stopped short of the acquittal would have lost an obvious opportunity for emphasizing one of its subordinate but far from unimportant objects. Rome is the goal of the Acts, and its author brings Paul to Rome. But if the apostle had stood before the Caesar, that was surely a far completer fulfilment of the prophecy that he should bear 'the Name before Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel' (ix 15) than his oration before a mere procurator like Festus and a petty king like Agrippa II (xxvi 2–13). Paul before Caesar would indeed have been a fitting scene for St. Luke's pen and a fitting climax for his work. And if St. Paul had already been successful in his appeal and been set free, how much better that would have served St. Luke's purposes than the declaration of Festus and Agrippa that there was no wrong in the man.

---

[1] *Not*, we notice, over the voyage to Rome, and yet here the pathos ought to have been the most intense, if the writer was aware that this journey, far more directly than the journey to Jerusalem, was going to lead to death.

[2] In the Gospel, which does reach its climax in a Passion preceded by a journey, the dramatic effect is made unmistakeable by direct predictions of the end.

[3] This acquittal is accepted now even by critics like Harnack and Jülicher, who reject the Pastoral Epistles as a whole.

If the later date be correct, St. Luke is guilty of nothing less than a literary crime: he excites all his readers' interest in the fate of St. Paul, and then leaves him without a word as to the conclusion.

More than this, St. Luke becomes actually misleading. He describes the journey up to Jerusalem as a farewell journey. St. Paul says his last words to the Church; he tells the Ephesians that they shall see his face no more. But if St. Paul was liberated and actually visited Ephesus again, St. Luke must have written differently and must have altered the whole complexion of the journey[1].

These considerations appear to establish at least a *prima facie* case against any date for the Acts after St. Paul's death or even liberation. It has been sought to meet them by the supposition that St. Luke had in store a third volume which would restore the balance and make all clear. Yet even so the silence of the Acts about St. Paul's fate would still be inexplicable: the charge of disproportion in chapters xx–xxviii would still hold: and this third volume, if it was to have *begun* with the persecution and martyrdom of the apostles, would still be quite out of analogy with the scheme of the Gospel and Acts.

III. Yet another difficulty lies in the tone of the Acts. A note of joy and an air of peace pervade the whole book. Persecutions there had been in plenty, but the writer is an optimist and sees how good has been brought out of evil. He has discovered a law that persecution is followed by a period of peace and progress[1], and when we come to the end peace and joy are triumphant. The apostle works at Rome without hindrance, and the optimist writer can take a tranquil retrospect of the past. Now could this tone have been possible after the martyrdom of the apostles? The great personal affection of St. Luke for St. Paul is obvious. Could he, after St. Paul's bloody death, sit down in his study and take a calm, peaceful, even joyful, view of the past? No doubt an optimistic temperament and strong religious faith will help much, but they cannot altogether suppress personal emotion.

---

[1] Supposing, on the other hand, that St. Paul after his liberation went to Spain and not to the East at all, the words could stand: but, in this case, why the silence about 'the boundary of the West,' when the work there would have been so fitting a fulfilment of the command to preach 'unto the end of the earth' (i 8)?

Nor is it a question here of St. Paul's death only. It is the situation of the Church at large which must have rendered impossible such a quiet retrospect. The cruel and bloody persecution of the Church at Rome under Nero must have been a greater disaster than the scattering of the Church at Jerusalem after the death of Stephen. It must have affected the whole Church. Hitherto there had been persecutions, but on a limited scale, with few deaths. Now the wholesale slaughter under Nero must have marked an epoch in the relations of the Church and the Empire. The Apocalypse gives us a faithful picture of the feeling of Christians towards the Babylon drunk with the blood of saints and martyrs. St. Luke's description in chapter xxviii 30, 31 would not only have been difficult to write but actually misleading.

If, then, St. Luke wrote subsequently to the Neronian persecution, it could only have been when the lapse of some years had restored peace to the Church, had healed its wounds, and had mitigated the personal grief for the loss of the apostle. This could hardly have been before '*circa* 80 A. D.'

Such a long interval has, however, its special difficulties.

A characteristic of the Acts is the remarkable fidelity of its pictures to the contemporary situation. This has, for instance, been strikingly brought out by Professor Ramsay in relation to the cities of Asia Minor. But the most noteworthy illustration is given by the early history of the Church at Jerusalem. There we find reproduced with exactness the condition of Jerusalem between 30 and 40 A.D., the relations of Pharisees and Sadducees, of Gamaliel and the high-priestly party, of Jews and Hellenists; the attitude of different parties to the Church; the simplicity of the Christian society, which appears as a continuance of the band of disciples in the Gospel, the place of the Lord being now filled by the apostles, and the whole body being nothing more on the outside than a Jewish αἵρεσις, 'the Nazarenes.' These conditions passed rapidly away; and if it was still possible for St. Luke, on a visit to Palestine and Jerusalem in 54–56 A.D., to realize the phenomena of Church life 'from the beginning,' that was just because the local church at Jerusalem, maintained its original character (xxi 17–26) in contrast to the speedy development which was taking place elsewhere. But after A.D. 70 and the end of the Church at Jerusalem, it must have been difficult in the extreme to draw such a vivid picture of Jewish politics; and great as were St. Luke's gifts it would argue a literary self-control which is almost inconceivable that the destruction of Jerusalem should nowhere have visibly affected his retrospect. But the reader rises from the book with the impression that the holy city is still standing, the Temple-service still maintained with earnest zeal (xxvi 7), and the Church still comprising at Jerusalem myriads of Jews zealous for the law (xxi 20). Yet how close was the bearing of the great catastrophe on the events recorded in St. Luke's history. It was the divine settlement of the controversy about the Law which had vexed the Church; it was the divine refutation of the Jewish charges against St. Stephen; it was the divine retribution for their persecution of the Church (cf. 1 Thess. ii 16); but not a dramatic hint is given or word uttered on any of these occasions.

---

[1] Compare iv 5–22, followed by 23–31 (esp. 31); v 40 by 41, 42; vi 8—viii 3 by viii 4—xi 26 (esp. ix 31); xii 1–17 by 24; xiii 50 by 52; xiv 2 by 3 (esp. Bezan text); xiv 5 by 7; xiv 19 by 21; xv 2–5 by 30–33 (*peace*).

Enough has been said as to St. Luke's silence over the death of St. Paul and the fall of Jerusalem. But even these, crucial as they were, were not the only events of stirring interest in the period 60–80 A.D. And the third volume theory, though it will explain the ending of the narrative at *circa* 60 A.D., will not explain the entire absence of any allusion to the events of the next twenty years. Not a hint in the Acts would enable a modern critic to conjecture, *e.g.*, the subsequent movements and fate of St. Peter, St. James the Lord's brother, or St. John, or the history of the Church at Jerusalem, at Ephesus, at Rome. How different it is in the case of St. John's Gospel. We can tell at once that St. Peter has been already girded and carried 'whither he would not,' and that the great age of St. John is arousing speculation among the brethren[1].

IV. A late date not only affects the artistic structure of the Acts, but its aim and object. No doubt the main motive still held good, viz. to continue the record of 'what Jesus began to do and to teach' (i. 1) in the Church. But besides this there were certainly subsidiary aims in the writer's mind.

(1) Among these, very obvious is the *apologia* for Christianity to the Roman authorities. And as such it would serve excellently—before 64 A.D. But Nero's persecution altered the whole relation of Church and Empire. That was settled from A.D. 64; the Emperor had declared war; Christianity had become a *religio illicita*; and St. Luke's arguments were thrown away. For his presentation of the origin and growth of Christianity was an appeal to authorities who would be ignorant of, and indifferent to, the facts of the case, and whose attitude was uncertain. Hitherto in individual cases they had asserted the innocence or harmlessness of the Christian teachers. But an appeal had been made to Caesar at Rome. At Rome and in the imperial court Jewish influence was strong. Something was wanted on the Christian side to counteract that influence: at least the judges—the public and the magistrates—ought to have a fair, impartial statement of the facts from the Christian point of view. And if St. Luke was contemplating a history, here was a reason for hurrying forward its composition and publication.

(2) The Acts is a vindication of the catholicity of the Church, and a proof of the true communion between Jewish and Gentile brethren. But in 80 A.D. no vindication of the existence of 'Churches of the Gentiles' was necessary. The question as to Jew and Gentile in the Church had been settled by facts. The

---

[1] It may of course be only an accident that in the Gospel and Acts we meet with the names of Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius; Nero appears only as 'Caesar'; and no later emperor is alluded to.

temple and its ritual had passed away, and the Church was predominantly Gentile. The distinctions between Hebrew, Jew, Hellenist, proselyte, Greek, and Gentile, were merged in the simple division between Jew and Christian, and their very meaning was being forgotten[1].

(3) If St. Luke was anxious to vindicate the apostolate of St. Paul as equal to that of St. Peter, and yet prove the true unity between them—what better proof could he have had than the dramatic picture of the two brother Apostles martyred at Rome, showing that 'in death they were not divided'?

V. There remain the literary questions. (1) It is clear that the writer has not used our Epistles of St. Paul as his authorities. They can be fitted in, but there was no special desire of illustrating or even harmonizing with them. This is evident from some *apparent* discrepancies, especially between the Acts and Galatians. If St. Luke wrote at a date when the Epistles were the public property of the Church and widely read, we cannot imagine his leaving such inconsistencies in their present form. But if he wrote before St. Paul's death all is clear. (*a*) The letters of St. Paul were numerous, our Epistles had not won their pre-eminent position, and as yet they were the private property of the Churches to whom they were addressed. St. Luke, instead of letters, had the living voice of the Apostle for his authority; and it is no fancy to trace a resemblance of diction between the latter part of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles. (*b*) St. Luke was writing at a time when the Epistle to the Galatians was not yet widely circulated. That Epistle contained the record of St. Paul's 'secret history' poured out to his apostate children. But St. Luke was writing for the Church at large, and gives, so to speak, the view from outside, the official report, what had transpired and had been made public. Secret conferences, secret motives and ideas in St. Paul's mind, may have been known to him, but they were private property as it were, suitable for an autobiography rather than for a book of 'Acts of Apostles.' St. Luke was addressing the general church public, who neither knew St. Paul's inner history, nor had any claim to know it. The position of the Acts would be very much that of a history of the Tractarian movement written before the publication of Newman's *Apologia* and the letters of Pusey and Keble.

---

[1] We might also notice that the Acts was written at a time when the question of John the Baptist's Disciples and Baptism was still a practical matter of some importance (xviii 24—xix 7).

(2) Critics in admitting the early date of many of the New Testament writings are recognizing the early development of Christian literature. Certainly the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, all written before A.D. 54 or 56, show it in a matured condition. St. Peter's first Epistle must have been written before A. D. 64 or 65, St. James' before 62. The conditions of the synoptic problem show that written Gospel sources must go back to a very early date even if we do not assign the first two canonical Gospels to the decade 60–70 A. D.[1] Why then should St. Luke's writings be postponed till about A. D. 80? The most favourable opportunity for collecting his information must have been the two years at Caesarea, A. D. 54–56 (or 58–60), and the time when he enjoyed the society of St. Paul: at Rome, during the two years of the first imprisonment, A. D. 57–59 (or 61–63), he had leisure for the composition. The need for 'certain and accurate information' (Luc. i 4) must have been great. Why then twenty years' delay?

VI. Lastly, we have the problem of the text of the Acts. A composite work like the Acts must have involved much revision and rewriting. Of this process we find, I believe, evident traces or relics in the Bezan text, which seems to represent what we should call 'advance-sheets' suffered by St. Luke to pass into circulation among the Roman Christians in answer to their impatient curiosity. But the Acts never did receive the last touches. Even in the form of the Neutral text—taking that to be the text as St. Luke left it—there remains in places an unevenness and obscurity which we feel that his skilled hand would never have allowed to appear in the published form[2]. If this be the case, the Acts never was really 'published' by the author, and consequently there was no final definite text. Some explanation of this sort is necessary to account for the phenomena of the diversities of text which are so unique in the case of the Acts.

---

[1] The Acts itself may be thought to suggest that it was written at a time when the chief authority for the Gospel history was still oral tradition: cf. xx 35, 'the words of the Lord Jesus.'

[2] Compare *e.g.* v 12–15; xii 25 (εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ); xiii 42, 43; xv 33, 40; xvi 19, 20 (see Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 217); xvii 8, 9, 13; xviii 18; xx 3–5; xxvii 9–12.

But if the actual publication never came about, what was the reason? May it not have been the persecution itself? That catastrophe, which must for the moment have shattered St. Luke's optimistic view and clouded the tranquil prospect, would at least have taken from him the heart to rewrite his history under the new conditions, even if it did not close his career by martyrdom.

These arguments are no doubt largely subjective; and their full force can perhaps only be felt by one who has studied the Acts with deep and affectionate sympathy. But taken together they leave a strong conviction that in the Acts we have the work of one who was writing at Rome about A.D. 60 by the side of St. Paul in his imprisonment; who, having leisure to review the past, felt the desire to leave to the Christian body some sure record of these things before the actors in them passed away, and to present both to Jews and Romans a fair statement of the case about St. Paul, entirely uncertain himself as to the final result save for the calm confidence inspired by experience of the past.

Against this—the natural impression given by the Acts itself—I know of but one solid argument, viz. that because of the variations in the Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem[1] the Gospel of St. Luke must have been written after A.D. 70 with a knowledge of the actual facts of the siege, and the Acts therefore later still. The differences are: the omission by St. Luke (xxi 20) of the words *let him that readeth understand*; the substitution of *Jerusalem compassed with armies*, &c. for *the abomination of desolation*; the omission of the *immediately* of Matt. xxiv 29; and the addition of one or two details in xxi 20–25, not to speak of the second and still more detailed picture in xix 43, 44.

Now (i) prophecy apart, it is certain that the Christians were expecting some disaster to befall Jerusalem: St. Paul wrote 1 Thess. ii 16 as early as 49 or 50 A.D. (ii) Writing for Gentile readers at Rome, St. Luke translates the imagery of the Old Testament into ordinary language: naturally too he omits the warning to flee. Similarly, but conversely, St. Matthew has emphasized the Jewish point of view by adding the mention of *Daniel the prophet* and substituting *the holy place* for the original phrase *where it ought not.* It is doubtful if the *immediately* of Matt. xxiv 29 is original, for it is absent from St. Mark; but in any case both St. Mark and St. Luke retain the connexion *And there shall be signs* with no more hint of an interval than in St. Matthew. (iii) The expressions used by St. Luke are quite general, and describe the ordinary features of the fall and capture of a city: (*a*) armies surround Jerusalem xxi 20, (*b*) cast a bank about it xix 43, (*c*) level it with the ground xix 44, (*d*) the inhabitants are slain with the sword or carried captive xxi 24, (*e*) Jerusalem is trodden under foot of the Gentiles xxi 24. Such a fate Jerusalem had already experienced more than once. (iv) And in fact all these expressions can be paralleled from the Old Testament[1]: in Westcott and Hort (*c*) and (*e*) are printed in quotation type. (v) Lastly, no detail is given which would be specially characteristic of the final fall of Jerusalem. There is no prophecy of the presence of Titus, the obstinate resistance, the internecine strife within the city, the famine and its attendant horrors[2], the burning of the Temple, or the fate of the rebel leaders.

---

[1] Luc. xxi 20–25 compared with Mt. xxiv 15–29, Mc. xiii 14–24: see also Luc. xix 43, 44.

That difficulties, sometimes real difficulties, may still be found in the Acts if the thesis of this paper finds favour, it is not necessary to deny. But as appreciation of the situation of the early Church grows greater the difficulties grow less. The Church then was very much as it is now: it embraced wide differences of character and personality, of theology and views, of education and learning. And in literature too there are differences between history and autobiography, differences in each writer's aim, differences in the public he appeals to, ample enough to account for any residuum of inconsistency or contradiction between the Acts and other authorities.

R. B. RACKHAM.

---

[1] See Is. xxix 3, xxxvii 33; Jer. vii 34, xx 4; 1 Kings viii 46; Is. v 5; Zech. xii 3; 1 Macc. iv 60; Ps. cxxxvi 9, lxxix 1; Dan. viii 10. St. Matthew (xxiv 2) and St. Mark (xiii 2) themselves specify the detail that not one stone shall be left upon another.

[2] Though St. Luke would have had precedent in the O. T. for the detail of *eating flesh* recorded by Josephus: cf. Jeremiah xix 9.

DOCUMENTS

THE SACRAMENTARY OF SERAPION OF THMUIS.

In one of the last numbers of the *Texte und Untersuchungen* (new series, vol. ii, part 3 *b*) Dr. G. Wobbermin has published the text of a collection of liturgical prayers contained in an eleventh-century MS belonging to the library of the Laura on Mount Athos. Mr. Kirsopp Lake, of Lincoln College, Oxford, while engaged in photographing codex Ψ of the Gospels in the summer of this year, was kind enough to find time also to photograph this MS and enable me to print the text anew with some few corrections.

The publication of this collection is an event of some importance for liturgical studies. The prayers would seem to be of a date not later than A.D. 350. They are thus the earliest liturgical collection on so large and comprehensive a scale, covering as they do something like the ground of the seventh and eighth books of the *Apostolic Constitutions* of a quarter of a century later. And they are Egyptian, and as such they fill a gap. Hitherto there has been singularly little detailed evidence for Egyptian usage in the fourth century. It is remarkable how much of the evidence for fourth-century usage is Syrian; the *Catecheses of St. Cyril*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Pilgrimage of Silvia*, and the large range of allusions in St. Chrysostom, form a mass of evidence quite unexampled in the same period. But in Egypt, beyond a few not very characteristic references in writers like St. Athanasius and St. Didymus, there has hitherto been nothing but the so-called *Egyptian Church Order*, which is meagre enough and of uncertain date and of ambiguous significance.

The titles of the collection, in the order of their occurrence in the MS, are the following :—

1. *Εὐχὴ προσφόρου Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου.*
2. *Μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἡ κλάσις καὶ ἐν τῇ κλάσει εὐχή.*
3. *Μετὰ τὸ διαδοῦναι τὴν κλάσιν τοῖς κληρικοῖς χειροθεσία λαοῦ.*
4. *Μετὰ τὴν διάδοσιν τοῦ λαοῦ εὐχή.*
5. *Εὐχὴ περὶ τῶν προσφερομένων ἐλαίων καὶ ὑδάτων.*
6. *Χειροθεσία μετὰ τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ τοῦ ἐλαίου.*
7. *Ἁγιασμὸς ὑδάτων.*

8. Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ βαπτιζομένων.
9. Μετὰ τὴν ἀποταγὴν εὐχή.
10. Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν εὐχή.
11. Μετὰ τὸ βαπτισθῆναι καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εὐχή.
12. Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως διακόνων.
13. Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως πρεσβυτέρων.
14. Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως ἐπισκόπου.
15. Προσευχ. Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου Θμούεως.

Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ἄλειμμα τῶν βαπτιζομένων.

16. Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ χρίσμα ἐν ᾧ χρίονται οἱ βαπτισθέντες.
17. Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον νοσούντων ἢ εἰς ἄρτον ἢ εἰς ὕδωρ.
18. Εὐχὴ περὶ τεθνεῶτος καὶ ἐκκομιζομένου.
19. Εὐχὴ πρώτη κυριακῆς.
20. Μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμιλίας εὐχή.
21. Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων.
22. Εὐχὴ περὶ νοσούντων.
23. Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ καρποφορίας.
24. Εὐχὴ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
25. Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
26. Εὐχὴ γονυκλισίας.
27. Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ λαοῦ.
28. Χειροθεσία κατηχουμένων.
29. Χειροθεσία λαϊκῶν.
30. Χειροθεσία νοσούντων.

Πᾶσαι αὗται εὐχαὶ ἐπιτελοῦνται πρὸ τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ προσφόρου.

From this it is obvious that the contents of the collection are not arranged in any proper order; the elements of the several rites are scattered up and down, and where they occur in groups it cannot be concluded that the contents of the groups are in the order of their occurrence in practice. So far as regards the rites generally, the whole may be re-distributed as follows:

1. The Liturgy, 19–30, 1–6.
2. The Order of Baptism and Confirmation, 7–11, 15, 16.
3. Ordinations, 12–14.
4. Unction of the Sick, 17.
5. Burial of the Dead, 18.

The collection is thus seen to cover a large part of the ritual system of the Church, apart from the Divine Service, and to correspond generally with the collection of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and with that of the earliest extant Byzantine book, the Barberini Codex of about A. D. 795. Dr. Wobbermin has described it as an Εὐχολόγιον, the Bishop of Salisbury as a Pontifical. But Εὐχολόγιον in use is rather a vague title, and in its strictest sense it does not include the Liturgy; while this collection does not seem to be intended exclusively for the use of a bishop, although it is no doubt true that in the fourth century the celebration of the sacraments, and in fact of all rites, was normally episcopal, and so far therefore any ritual book of that period might be described as a Pontifical. Both 'Euchologion' and 'Pontifical' are in fact titles too far developed to be applied to any of these collections; and they are better described as Sacramentaries. Our Athos book is quite rudimentary as a Sacramentary: it is exclusively a celebrant's *libellus*, with no indication of the parts of the deacon and the minor orders, with only one at most of the standing formulae which form the permanent framework of the rites, and with no rubrics beyond two or three notes and what is implied in the titles of the several prayers.

Again, it will be seen that the name of Serapion is prefixed to nos. 1 and 15. But Dr. Wobbermin is not quite right when he says that only two prayers are attributed to him; for it is obvious that in the note before no. 15 προσευχαί is to be read, and not with Dr. Wobbermin προσευχή. In the MS the word is contracted, the Χ being written above the Υ, and it is evidently intended to apply to two or more of the series which follows. How far the application is to be carried is not clear; perhaps to all the rest of the series, but almost certainly down to 18, after which a new series begins, to which the concluding note refers. It may be assumed therefore that at least nos. 1 and 15–18 are attributed to Serapion. And it may well be that the whole collection is to be included. Allowing for difference of subject-matter, there are no marked differences either of language and style or of character to be discerned in the several prayers. It is true e. g. that the titles Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας and Θεὸς τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν belong generally to different groups; that ὁ Λόγος is characteristic of the baptismal prayers and the anaphora of the mass; and that the doxologies of 12–14 and 22–29 are more uniform than in the other groups: but these are scarcely important distinctions. And, on the other hand, it is not uncommon in liturgical documents to find the real or supposed author's name attached to the titles of individual prayers of a series, the whole of which is meant to be attributed to the same author.

The Serapion referred to, as appears from the note before no. 15, is the bishop of Thmuis in the Delta (Tell-et-Tmai), near the Mendesian branch of the Nile, the friend of St. Antony and himself an ex-abbat, who headed the embassy sent by Athanasius to Constantius in 353 (Ath. *Vit. Ant.* 82, 91, *ad Dracont.* 7: *Hist. Acephala* iii); to whom Athanasius addressed the letter appended to his 11th Festal epistle (339), the *de morte Arii* (358) and the four epistles on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost (*c.* 358); who is noticed by St. Jerome (*de vir. illust.* 99) as surnamed *Scholasticus* and as the author of a work against the Manichaeans (mentioned also in St. Epiph. *Haer.* lxvi 21), of another on the titles of the Psalms, and of epistles; and one of whose sayings is related from Evagrius by Socrates (*H. E.* iv 23). The extant works attributed to him are the treatise against the Manichaeans, a letter to one Eudoxius, and a letter to the Egyptian monks (Migne *P. G.* xl).

There seems to be no reason why the present collection of prayers should not, in whole or in part, be the work of Serapion. It is hazardous to speculate about motives, but it is perhaps difficult to see why a work of such small importance or interest in itself should be attributed to any individual without good reason. As to style, that of the works hitherto attributed to him, on a slight acquaintance, leaves an impression of simplicity and naïveté which contrasts with that of the great Egyptian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries; and the style of the prayers is simple even to baldness, and there are coincidences of vocabulary, perhaps too slight to be of importance. It is true the language of the works is smoother and less abrupt than that of the prayers, which sometimes suggest that Greek was not quite congenial to the writer; but, even so, Serapion, if he were the first, would perhaps not be the last prelate whose liturgical compositions were not the happiest item in his literary record. But however this may be, the name of Serapion can at least stand as a symbol of the date and provenance of the prayers, so far as these can be gathered from internal indications. For these indications, so far as they go, point to the middle of the fourth century, to Egypt and the Delta.

1. The indications of date are the theology, the form of the doxologies, and the ecclesiastical conditions.

a. The theological interest is not marked; the writer expatiates but little on theological topics, and where he does so, it is mainly in reference to the Person of the Eternal Father. It is obvious at once that his dominant interest is in the moral applications of the faith. But his theology is orthodox, if reserved, and there are signs of an anti-Arian polemic. The language is Nicene so far as it goes; but it is not of Athanasian fullness, nor do the distinctive Nicene phrases occur. Perhaps the fullest expression, apart from the preface of the Liturgy, is in no. 20, where the Father is addressed as ὁ γεννήτωρ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ὁ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τὸν ζῶντα καὶ ἀληθινὸν γεννήσας. The Son is referred to habitually and emphatically as ὁ μονογενής, and otherwise as ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής (1), ὁ ἀγαπητὸς υἱός (1), ὁ γεγενημμένος (1) or ἄρρητος (7) or μονογενής (8, 10) or ἅγιος (10) Λόγος, ἡ θεία καὶ ἀόρατος δύναμις (16: cf. St. Ath. *c. Arian.* i 11, 12, ii 2) of the Father. On the other hand, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost is undeveloped. The common phrase is ἅγιον Πνεῦμα simply; twice τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα (8, 10); the conception is economic, and there is little, if anything, of the internal and eternal relation to the Father and the Son; for τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ μονογενοῦς (13) seems to refer to the indwelling in the Incarnate, not to the eternal relation. In the preface of the mass there is what seems to be a definite anti-Arian passage, on the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son (αἰνοῦμέν σε τὸν γιγνωσκόμενον . . . διερμηνευόμενον τοῖς ἁγίοις). This, founded on Matt. xi 27, Luc. x 22, seems to be addressed to the Arian position of the Son's ignorance of the Father and of His own essence, as quoted from the *Thalia* in St. Ath. *c. Arian.* i 6 (cf. *ib.*

9, ii 22: St. Alex. Al. ap. Socr. *H. E.* i 6). The theology therefore seems quite to correspond to the position of a man with that practical interest which could prompt the *Epistola ad monachos*, but who needed the instruction of St. Athanasius in view of the Macedonian question; and anyhow to belong to the middle of the fourth century at latest.

b. The doxologies throughout are in the form 'to the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost.' This, as is well known, is a form which was long in use, and was perhaps the usual form, at least in some churches. Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii 13) asserts that the co-ordinate form ('to . . . to . . . to') was first used by Flavian of Antioch (*c.* 350); but this is the prejudiced statement of an Arian, which is sufficiently refuted by St. Basil *de Spiritu Sancto.* But the form 'to . . . through . . . in' was taken up by the Arian party as capable of interpretation in the sense of implying the inferiority of the Son and the Holy Ghost (cp. Soz. *H. E.* iii 20), and became a mark of Arianism, while it went out of use among the orthodox. The story of Leontius of Antioch (344–357: Theodt. *H. E.* ii 24; Soz. *l. c.*), who concealed his own dogmatic position by habitually suppressing the opening of the doxology and becoming audible only at the εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, is well known. The form 'to . . . through . . . in' is found occasionally in St. Athanasius (see note on no. 1 below); while in about 370 in Egypt St. Didymus treats it as simply heretical (*de Trin.* i 32, 34, iii 23). It has almost entirely vanished from surviving liturgical documents, perhaps occurring nowhere but in the preanaphoral prayers of the liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Its use therefore in the present document, to the entire exclusion of any co-ordinating form, points to the middle of the fourth century as its latest possible date.

c. Ecclesiastical conditions, so far as the indications go, are suitable to, if they do not necessarily demand, the same period. The organization of the ministry (bishop, presbyter, deacon, subdeacon, reader, interpreter) is less developed than that of the Asian Church as implied in the canons of Laodicea or that of the Syrian Church as described in the *Apostolic Constitutions,* say in 370. The appropriation of the mass to Sunday (cp. Ath. *ap. c. Ar.* 11), to the exclusion of Saturday, implied in the title εὐχὴ πρώτη κυριακῆς (19), marks a date earlier than the rise of the observance of the Sabbath, which was coming into use in the East by *c.* 375 and was already established in Egypt under Timothy of Alexandria (*c.* 380, *Respons. canon.* 13: cp. Cassian *Instt.* iii 2, [Ath.] *hom. de Semente* 1 [ii 60]; but see Socr. *H. E.* v 22). The reference to monasticism is reserved and meagre: μονάζοντες and παρθενεύουσαι are taken for granted, but there is no emphasis on them. The second prayer of the liturgy seems to imply that the population of Thmuis (?) was still mainly pagan.

And the consecrations of oil and water, which are characteristic of this collection, correspond to and are interpreted by the usages of the early fathers of the desert.

2. That the usages here represented are Egyptian is shown—apart from the character of the Order of the Mass and a few parallels to other Egyptian forms which shall be dealt with below and in the notes—by the form of the doxologies, the illustrations of the Egyptian creed, and the conditions implied.

a. In every case but two (18, 25), the doxology concludes with εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. This ending still survives in the response Ὥσπερ ἦν κτλ at the end of the anaphora in the Egyptian liturgies, both Greek and Coptic[1]; it is found in two doxologies of St. Athanasius and in one of St. Isaiah the Abbat (see note on the first prayer of the Liturgy). Otherwise I do not know it except in *Hom. Clem.* iii 72 (without τῶν αἰώνων) and in the *per omnia saecula saeculorum* of the Roman canon and some other Western formulae; and affinities between Egyptian and Western usages are common and always to be looked for.

b. A comparison of the Letter of St. Alexander of Alexandria (Thdt. *H. E.* i 4), the *Expositio fidei* of St. Athanasius, the Creed of Macarius (Migne *P. G.* xxxiv 212; Kattenbusch *das apost. Symb.* ii p. 242), and other Egyptian documents, suggests that the Egyptian creed had at least three characteristic points: (1) τὸν ἀγένητον Πατέρα in the first article; (2) ἐπιδημήσαντα in the third; (3) μόνην with ἐκκλησίαν in the ninth. It is possible to construct a creed out of the language of the present prayers, and to conclude that these three characteristics were familiar to the writer. Ἀγένητος is the standing epithet of the Father throughout, and ὁ ἀγένητος simply is commonly used: ἐπιδημία is the usual title of the Incarnation and ἐπιδημεῖν is a characteristic word in similar connexions; and the fullest expression for the Church (23) is τὴν ἁγίαν σου καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

c. The occurrence of interpreters among the minor orders points to a bilingual Church, i. e. practically either to Syria or to Egypt. The evidence for the use of consecrated oil for the healing of the sick seems to be earlier for Egypt than for elsewhere, at least in the East, and in the fourth century to be exclusively Egyptian. And that it is the Delta and not the Nile valley which is implied, is suggested by the prayer ὑπὲρ καρποφορίας (23), where the rains are prayed for, while the usual Egyptian petitions for the rise of the Nile do not occur.

---

[1] i. e. in the Greek St. Mark and in the Coptic, where the response is of course in Greek. In the Greek St. Basil and St. Gregory, which survive in a single MS, the response is indicated only by its opening words; but there is no reason to suppose that the form indicated is other than that of St. Mark or the Coptic.

I. The Liturgy.

The most important of the rites is of course the Mass. Of this the preanaphoral prayers are placed last in the collection, while the anaphora stands first. The form is of special importance in two respects, as showing, first, that the general type for which the evidence is so predominantly Syrian in the fourth century was not merely Syrian, and, secondly, that the special Egyptian type had already emerged in the middle of the century.

The following points may be noticed:

1. The '*first prayer*' (19). This is a peculiar feature which has hitherto, I think, escaped notice. So far as appears, in the fourth century the rite generally opened simply with the salutation followed by the lections. And the hitherto known Egyptian forms have been so far modified or elaborated in the mass of the catechumens that their original and essential features have become undistinguishable. The Coptic and Ethiopic forms have become loaded with censings and multiplied prayers; the Greek St. Basil and St. Gregory are incomplete in the mass of the catechumens; but possibly the prayer before the Gospel in all these forms represents the original 'first prayer.' The Greek St. Mark has been byzantinized till its Egyptian features have largely vanished or been transformed to other purposes; but we are now enabled to recognize the prayer Δέσποτα κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ (*Liturgies Eastern and Western* i p. 117), which is labelled with the Byzantine title εὐχὴ τρισαγίου, as the 'first prayer,' corresponding as it does in position and contents with the 'first prayer' of Serapion. No other Eastern rite has a corresponding feature, and it is obvious to compare it with the Western collect.

2. The *prayer after the sermon* (20). This corresponds to the prayer 'O long-suffering' of the Coptic and Abyssinian rites (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 157, 220), which has probably vanished from the Greek St. Mark, and to the Ὁ ἐνηχήσας ἡμᾶς of the Greek St. James (*ib.* p. 38). Elsewhere it does not occur. It probably illustrates and is illustrated by the *surgentes oremus* at the conclusion of some of Origen's sermons (see note below) and the African *conversi ad Dominum* common at the end of St. Augustine's sermons.

3. The following prayers (21–30). These offer a difficulty, inasmuch as they seem evidently not to be given in their right order, and it is hard to arrange them satisfactorily. It seems probable that the three blessings (χειροθεσίαι, 28–30) are grouped together as formulae of one kind, perhaps as episcopal acts, and that they are to be inserted in their places in the preceding series. There is little difficulty about the Prayer and the Blessing of the Catechumens (21, 28); they must stand first,

and be followed by the dismissal. The rest of the series corresponds generally to Egyptian usage, which is marked by an exceptionally emphatic body of intercessions on the part of the celebrants at this point; while in other rites there is nothing but the deacon's litany and a prayer of inclination or, in the Byzantine, two 'prayers of the faithful.' Perhaps the Egyptian use of 'table prayers' on Wednesdays and Fridays (Socr. *H. E.* v 22) accounts for this multiplication of prayers. The arrangement of Serapion's prayers must remain uncertain at present; perhaps it is impossible to sort them without knowing what the deacon was doing; and the arrangement adopted below is only a suggestion. The general intercession (27) with its corresponding blessing (29) is placed first, and the more specialised petitions follow. They were probably accompanied throughout by biddings on the part of the deacon, after the Egyptian manner. It may be suggested that the εὐχὴ γονυκλισίας (26), which stands last, is the origin of the Egyptian peculiarity 'the prayer of the veil.'

4. The *Kiss of Peace* is of course to be assumed; it is mentioned by Origen on the one hand and by Timothy of Alexandria on the other. But the omission of any allusion to it here shows that the Prayer of the Kiss, a characteristic of the existing Syrian and Egyptian rites, is of later origin in Egypt, and was perhaps borrowed from the Syrian.

5. The *Offertory*. According to all analogy an offertory prayer would be an anachronism in the fourth century. Hence, while the Offertory is referred to later on in the intercession after the consecration (εὐλόγησον τοὺς προσενεγκόντας τὰ πρόσφορα καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας), no allusion to it is to be expected at the point where it occurs. It is almost certainly to be placed here. In the Coptic and Abyssinian uses it has been wholly removed to the beginning of the rite; but a fragment of it survives at this point in the Greek St. Mark, in the deacon's exclamation and the prayer of oblation (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 124).

6. The *Anaphora* (i) implies that the framework of the Egyptian form is already fixed. For, first, the paragraph Σὺ γὰρ ὁ ὑπεράνω, which is obviously altogether superior in style to what precedes, is identical in the main with that of St. Mark, Greek and Coptic. It forms the basis of the preface, to which Serapion's preface is attached like a western proper to the common *Et ideo cum* or *Per quem maiestatem tuam*; and the line of demarcation between the proper and the common is still marked in the Greek and Coptic. Secondly, the transition from the Sanctus to the Institution corresponds closely in thought and language to that of St. Mark. And thirdly, the concluding Ὥσπερ ἦν κτλ, which I have ventured to mark as a response and not as part of the doxology (cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 134, 180, 190, 233), is already here, and must be the conventional conclusion of the anaphora, older than Serapion, since

it stands in no real connexion with what precedes, and strictly makes no sense. Of course it may well be that the preceding doxology is contracted; but this would only make it more obvious that the conclusion of the anaphora is already a well-known standing formula. Serapion also confirms what was before obvious from the Greek and Coptic texts of St. Mark, that the intercession in the middle of its preface is an insertion. This curious feature has commonly been regarded—and the Abyssinians in adopting it into their anaphora must have taken the same view—as a proper characteristic of the Egyptian rite as hitherto known; and St. Basil and St. Gregory, with their intercessions in the Syrian position after consecration, have consequently been regarded as foreign material only partially accommodated to Egyptian form. But Serapion's anaphora, with its intercession, such as it is, in the same Syrian position, shows that St. Basil and St. Gregory are not after all in this respect strange to Egyptian use, and that the inserted supplication in St. Mark is possibly a substitute for a more original intercession after consecration.

(ii) Of the special features of Serapion's anaphora the following may be noted:—

a. The *Sanctus* is in its simplest form, differing from Isa. vi 3 only in the addition of ὁ οὐρανὸς καί, a form which is sometimes quoted, and was probably the usual one, in the fourth century, and identical in sense with that of St. Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* 34 § 6). Though the fuller form with the *hosanna* and *benedictus* was imported into Egypt along with the matter of St. Basil and St. Gregory, this simpler form, merely with the addition of ἁγίας before δόξης, has continued to be the proper Egyptian *sanctus*, and is used in St. Mark and the Abyssinian liturgies. The *Apostolic Constitutions* suggest that the *hosanna* and *benedictus* have been moved back from just before the communion (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 24); and the occurrence of the *benedictus* in that position in the Coptic rite (as also in the Byzantine) suggests that that is its original position elsewhere as well as in Syria (*ib.* 186, 396).

b. The *Institution* is in an equally simple form. It is entirely scriptural, except for the addition of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν with the bread, and λάβετε with the chalice, both of which are merely assimilations of the two Institutions, while the latter is found in some New Testament texts. Both these additions are found in the Coptic St. Mark. The use of the text of St. Mark viii 6 (the feeding of the 5,000) and the somewhat peculiar rendering of the Pauline words of the institution of the chalice are also to be noted. But there are none of the expansions characteristic of later rites, and in particular there is no allusion to our Lord's hands and eyes. Nor is τοῦτο ποιεῖτε κτλ used in either Institution, a characteristic shared only by the Byzantine St. Chrysostom among the great rites. At the same time the idea of these words is implied in the somewhat laboured explanations with both Institutions of the significance of each element (before consecration, be it noted), as 'the likeness of the body,' 'the likeness of the death,' 'the likeness of the blood' of the Only-begotten. But the chief peculiarity of Serapion is the severance of the two Institutions by a passage of some length of an intercessory character, including a quotation from the prayer of *Didache* ix 4. This is scarcely a happy feature, destroying as it does the balance of the action; and perhaps it is, happily, unparallelled.

c. The form of the *Invocation* is peculiar in two or three respects. First, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν not having been quoted, the Invocation does not open, as is usual, with μεμνημένοι οὖν or the like, and there is no detailing of the contents of the commemoration. The preceding 'likeness of the body,' 'of the death,' 'of the blood' is all that corresponds to the usual detailed commemoration, and this is peculiar both in form and in the narrowness of its range. Secondly, the Word of God is invoked without reference to the Holy Ghost; and this seems to be unique. And thirdly, ἐπιδημῆσαι is used to describe the coming of the Word on to the oblation, a word habitually used of the Incarnation and occasionally of the coming of the Holy Ghost, but not elsewhere, so far as I know, in this connexion.

7. A *Prayer of the Fraction* is a Syrian and Egyptian characteristic. It has been eliminated from the byzantinized texts of the Greek St. James and St. Mark; but it remains in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic. And in the Egyptian forms it corresponds in character with the prayer of Serapion (2), as a prayer before communion. And whereas in the Coptic it has become a prelude to the Lord's Prayer, to which it is attached by the form of its conclusion (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 181), in the Ethiopic it is quite independent in form and merely stands before the Lord's Prayer, or rather includes it, the Lord's Prayer being interpolated into the middle of it (*ib.* pp. 191, 234).

8. I know of no Egyptian evidence for the use of the *Lord's Prayer* in the mass in the fourth century, unless St. Didymus gives a hint in his remark that it is used only by the baptized (*de Trin.* iii 39). But, in spite of the silence of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, it was used in the Syrian order of the fourth century (St. Cyr. Hier. *Cat.* xxiii 11–18; St. Chrys. *hom. xxvii in Gen.* 8); and it is certainly implied in the *Ethiopic Church Order*, to whatever date that may be assigned (see note below). In accordance with the current Egyptian forms I have inserted it at this point. In the Greek St. Mark it has been shifted to the Byzantine position, before the Fraction, as also in the Greek St. James (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 60, 136). It is just possible that μετὰ τὴν εὐχήν, before the prayer of fraction above, refers to the Lord's

Prayer, 'the prayer' κατ' ἐξοχήν, and not to the εὐχὴ προσφόρου: and if so, the Coptic order, followed by the Ethiopic, must have been modified since the fourth century.

9. The *Communion* (3, 4, 6). There is a peculiarity here: the communion of the ministers precedes the preliminary communion-prayer of the people. Normally the clergy's communion is merely the beginning of the general communion and is included under the general communion-prayer. And it is just possible that τὸ διαδοῦναι τὴν κλάσιν does not refer to the communion of the clergy, but to the distribution of the particles among the ministers for communicating the people, while the communion of the ministers is silently implied. Otherwise the communion is in quite normal form and confirms what may be gathered from a comparison of the current liturgical texts to have been its original form. The Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις and the so-called elevation are of course not mentioned, in accordance with the scope of the collection. There seems to be no Egyptian evidence for the τὰ ἅγια before St. Cyril, unless St. Didymus' frequent use of one form of the response to it Εἷς ἅγιος κτλ. be evidence (*de Trin.* ii 6, 7, iii 13); but no doubt it was in use, and the elevation is originally only the lifting up of the Sacrament as it is brought from the altar and offered to the people. If the Egyptian texts, Greek, Coptic and Ethiopic, be compared at this point, they are found to have in common three prayers—a preliminary prayer of inclination (χειροθεσία), a thanksgiving after communion, and a final prayer of inclination (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 137, 141 sq., 183, 186 sq., 191 sq., 235, 243). The same form results from a comparison of Syrian forms, Greek and Syriac, and it is confirmed for the fourth century by the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*ib.* pp. 24–27). And this is exactly what we have here: a χειροθεσία λαοῦ (3), a prayer μετὰ τὴν διάδοσιν (4), and a final χειροθεσία (6). The form of communion, the words of administration, are found in the *Egyptian Church Order*.

10. Before the final χειροθεσία is inserted the occasional blessing of oil and water (5). This position is peculiar. In the *Ethiopic Church Order* it closes the anaphora, being inserted before the final 'As it was' &c. (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 190); and herein the *Church Order* follows its source, the Canons of Hippolytus (ed. Achelis, p. 56)[1]. And that position is normal. In the Roman rite the blessing of milk and honey for the neophytes on the vigil of Pentecost (*Sacr. Leon.* ap. Muratori, i c. 318), of first-fruits on Ascension Day (*Sacr. Gelas.* i 63, ed. Wilson, p. 107) and of the new grapes on Aug. 6 (*Sacr. Greg.* ap. Muratori, ii c. 109; cp. *Sacr. Gelas.* iii 88, p. 294) preceded the *per quem haec omnia* at the

---

[1] Unless the consecration of the oil is an Egyptian interpolation in the Arabic of these canons.

end of the canon, as the consecration of the oil of the catechumens on Maundy Thursday does still (*Sacr. Gelas.* i 40, p. 70); and in the Orthodox rite the Chrism is consecrated on Maundy Thursday at the corresponding point, before the Πάντων τῶν ἁγίων and the prelude of the Lord's Prayer (Goar Εὐχολόγιον, ed. 1730, pp. 502 sq.).

THE LITURGY

⟨MASS OF THE CATECHUMENS⟩

⟨THE LECTIONS AND THE SERMON⟩

Εὐχὴ πρώτη κυριακῆς (19)

Παρακαλοῦμεν σὲ τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς, τὸν κύριον τοῦ παντός, τὸν δημιουργὸν τῶν κτισμάτων, τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πεποιημένων· καθαρὰς ἐκτείνομεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὰς διανοίας ἀναπετάννυμεν πρὸς σὲ Κύριε· δεόμεθα, οἴκτειρον φεῖσαι εὐεργέτησον βελτίωσον, πλήθυνον ἐν ἀρετῇ καὶ πίστει καὶ γνώσει· ἐπίσκεψαι ἡμᾶς *Κύριε, πρὸς σὲ τὰς ἀσθενείας ἑαυτῶν ἀναπέμπομεν· ἱλάσθητι καὶ ἐλέησον κοινῇ πάντας ἡμᾶς· ἐλέησον τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, εὐεργέτησον, ἐπιεικῆ καὶ σώφρονα καὶ καθαρὸν ποίησον, καὶ δυνάμεις ἀγγελικὰς ἀπόστειλον, ἵνα ὁ λαός σου οὗτος ἅπας ἅγιος καὶ σεμνὸς ᾖ. παρακαλῶ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀπόστειλον εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διάνοιαν καὶ χάρισαι ἡμῖν μαθεῖν τὰς θείας γραφὰς ἀπὸ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ διερμηνεύειν καθαρῶς καὶ ἀξίως, ἵνα ὠφεληθῶσιν οἱ παρόντες λαοὶ πάντες· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.*

The Lections

The Sermon

Μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμιλίας εὐχὴ (20)

Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ σωτήρ, *ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ παντός, ὁ τῶν ὅλων κύριος καὶ δημιουργός, ὁ γεννήτωρ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ὁ τὸν* χαρακτῆρα *τὸν ζῶντα καὶ ἀληθινὸν γεννήσας, ὁ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐτὸν ἀποστείλας, ὁ δι' αὐτοῦ καλέσας καὶ προσποιησάμενος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· δεόμεθά σου ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου· Πνεῦμα ἅγιον πέμψον καὶ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐπισκεψάσθω, λαλησάτω ἐν ταῖς διανοίαις πάντων καὶ προοικονομησάτω εἰς πίστιν τὰς καρδίας· αὐτὸς πρὸς σὲ ἑλκυσάτω τὰς ψυχὰς Θεὲ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν·*

9 Ps. cv 4. 23 Ps. xxvi 9. 24 Heb. i 3.

κτῆσαι λαὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, κτῆσαι ποίμνιον γνήσιον· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δι᾽ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE DISMISSAL OF THE CATECHUMENS⟩

Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τῶν Κατηχουμένων (21)

Βοηθὲ καὶ κύριε τῶν ἁπάντων, ἐλευθερωτὰ τῶν ἐλευθερωθέντων, προστάτα τῶν ῥυσθέντων, ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιάν σου χεῖρα γεγονότων· σὺ εἶ ὁ τὴν ἀνομίαν καθῃρηκώς, ὁ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς καταργήσας τὸν Σατανᾶν καὶ λύσας αὐτοῦ τὰ τεχνάσματα καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ δεδεμένους· εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων, ὅτι κέκληκας αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς καὶ γνῶσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν σὴν ἐχαρίσω· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δεόμεθα, βεβαιωθήτωσαν ἐν τῇ γνώσει, ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· διαφυλαττέσθωσαν ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασιν καὶ ἐν τῇ καθαρᾷ φρονήσει καὶ προκοπτέτωσαν ἄξιοι γενέσθαι τοῦ λουτροῦ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας καὶ τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δι᾽ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν

Χειροθεσία κατηχουμένων (28)

Τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνομεν δέσποτα καὶ δεόμεθα τὴν χεῖρα τὴν θείαν καὶ ζῶσαν ἐκταθῆναι εἰς εὐλογίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ· σοὶ γὰρ ἀγένητε Πάτερ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς κεκλίκασιν τὰς κεφαλάς· εὐλόγησον τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἰς εὐλογίαν γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας, εἰς εὐλογίαν τῶν σῶν μυστηρίων· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν

The Catechumens withdraw.

⟨MASS OF THE FAITHFUL⟩

⟨THE PRAYERS⟩

Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ Λαοῦ (27)

Ἐξομολογούμεθά σοι φιλάνθρωπε Θεὲ καὶ προσρίπτομεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς ἀσθενείας καὶ δύναμιν ἡμῖν προσγενέσθαι παρακαλοῦμεν. σύγγνωθι τοῖς προγεγενημένοις ἁμαρτήμασιν καὶ ἄφες πάντα τὰ

---

8 1 Pet. v 6. 10 Heb. ii 14; 1 Jo. iii 8. 11 Luc. xiii 16. 14 Jo. xvii 3. 17 Tit. iii 5.

παρῳχημένα σφάλματα καὶ ποίησον καινοὺς ἀνθρώπους. δεῖξον ἡμᾶς καὶ δούλους γνησίους καὶ καθαρούς· σοὶ ἀνατίθεμεν ἑαυτούς, δέχου ἡμᾶς Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας, δέχου τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον· δὸς ὅλον γνήσιον γενέσθαι, δὸς ὅλον ἀμέμπτως καὶ καθαρῶς πολιτεύεσθαι. συμμετρηθήτωσαν τοῖς οὐρανίοις, συναριθμηθήτωσαν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, ὅλοι ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ ἅγιοι γενέσθωσαν.

Παρακαλοῦμέν σε ὑπὲρ τῶν πεπιστευκότων καὶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκότων, βεβαιωθήτωσαν ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ τῇ γνώσει καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ.

Δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καταλλάγηθι πᾶσιν, γνώρισον ἑαυτόν, ἀποκάλυψόν σου τὸ φέγγος· γνώτωσάν σε πάντες τὸν ἀγένητον Πατέρα καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ σου Υἱὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

Δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀρχόντων, εἰρηνικὸν τὸν βίον ἐχέτωσαν ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.

Δεόμεθα Θεὲ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων, ἀρρένων καὶ γυναικῶν, γερόντων καὶ παιδίων, πενήτων καὶ πλουσίων· πᾶσιν τὸ ἴδιόν σου δεῖξον χρηστὸν καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν σου πᾶσιν πρότεινον φιλανθρωπίαν· πάντας οἴκτειρον καὶ πᾶσιν χάρισαι τὴν πρὸς σὲ ἐπιστροφήν.

Παρακαλοῦμεν ὑπὲρ ἀποδημούντων, χάρισαι αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον εἰρηνικὸν συνοδοιπόρον γενέσθαι, ἵνα μηδὲν ὑπὸ μηδενὸς ζημιωθῶσιν, ἵνα ἐν πολλῇ εὐθυμίᾳ τὸν πλοῦν καὶ τὰς ἀποδημίας αὐτῶν διανύσωσιν.

Παρακαλοῦμεν ὑπὲρ τεθλιμμένων καὶ δεδεμένων καὶ πενήτων· ἀνάπαυσον ἕκαστον, ἀπάλλαξον δεσμῶν, ἐξένεγκον τῆς πενίας, παρηγόρησον πάντας ὁ παρηγορῶν καὶ παραμυθούμενος.

Δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ νοσούντων, ὑγείαν χάρισαι καὶ τῆς νόσου ἀνάστησον καὶ ποίησον αὐτοὺς τελείαν ἔχειν ὑγείαν σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς.

Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ εὐεργέτης, σὺ εἶ ὁ πάντων κύριος καὶ βασιλεύς· σὲ παρακεκλήκαμεν ὑπὲρ πάντων διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ ⟨κράτο⟩ς ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Χειροθεσία λαϊκῶν (29)

Ἡ ζῶσα καὶ καθαρὰ χείρ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ἡ πάντα τὰ πονηρὰ καθηρηκυῖα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἅγια βεβαιώσασ⟨α⟩ καὶ ἠσφαλισμένη, ἐκταθήτω ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου· εὐλογηθείη ὁ

---

1 Eph. iv 24. 3 Ps. xxx 6. 8 Col. ii 7. 11 Jo. xvii 3.

λαὸς οὗτος εὐλογίᾳ Πνεύματος, εὐλογίᾳ οὐρανοῦ, εὐλογίᾳ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων· εὐλογηθείη τὰ σώματα τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς σωφροσύνην καὶ καθαρότητα· εὐλογηθείησαν αἱ ψυχαὶ αὐτῶν εἰς μάθησιν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια· εὐλογηθείησαν κοινῇ πάντες· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας ⟨τῶν⟩ αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Εὐχὴ περὶ Νοσούντων (22)

Παρακαλοῦμεν σὲ τὸν ἔφορον καὶ κύριον καὶ πλάστην τοῦ σώματος καὶ ποιητὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν ἁρμοσάμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν οἰκονόμον καὶ κυβερνήτην καὶ σωτῆρα παντὸς τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸν καταλ⟨λ⟩ασσόμενον καὶ πραϋνόμενον διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φιλανθρωπίαν· ἱλάσθητι δέσποτα· βοήθησον καὶ ἴασαι πάντας τοὺς νοσοῦντας. ἐπιτίμησον τοῖς νοσήμασιν· ἀνάστησον τοὺς κατακειμένους· δὸς δόξαν τῷ ὀνόματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Χειροθεσία νοσούντων (30)

Κύριε Θεὲ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα καὶ χάρισαι θεραπευθῆναι τοὺς νοσοῦντας πάντας· χάρισαι τῆς ὑγείας ἀξιωθῆναι, ἀπάλλαξον αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐπικειμένης νόσου· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου θεραπευθήτωσαν, γενέσθω αὐτοῖς φάρμακον τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα εἰς ὑγείαν καὶ ὁλοκληρίαν· ὅτι δι’ αὐτοῦ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν ⟨αἰ⟩ώνων. ἀμήν.

Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ Καρποφορίας (23)

Οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς δημιουργέ, ὁ τὸν οὐρανὸν διὰ τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν ἀστέρων στεφανώσας καὶ διὰ τῶν φωστήρων λαμπρύνας, ὁ τὴν γῆν τοῖς καρποῖς τιμήσας πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ †χαρισάμενος τῷ γένει τῷ ὑπὸ σοῦ πεπλασμένῳ† ἄνωθεν μὲν ἀπολαύειν τῆς αὐγῆς καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς τῶν φωστήρων, κάτωθεν δὲ τρέφεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς· δεόμεθα χάρισαι τοὺς ὑετοὺς πληρεστάτους καὶ γονιμωτάτους· ποίησον δὲ καὶ τὴν γῆν καρποφορῆσαι καὶ πολλὴν ἐνέγκαι εὐφορίαν ἕνεκεν τῆς σῆς φιλανθρωπίας καὶ χρηστότητος· μνήσθητι τῶν σὲ ἐπικαλουμένων, τίμησον τὴν ἁγίαν σου καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εἰσάκουσον τῶν παρακλήσεων καὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν γῆν πᾶσαν· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος

---

14 Luc. iv 39. 15 Ps. cxiii 9. 35 Tit. iii 4.

ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Εὐχὴ περὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (24)

Κύριε Θεὲ τῶν αἰώνων, Θεὲ τῶν λογικῶν πνευμάτων, Θεὲ ψυχῶν καθαρῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν γνησίως σε καὶ καθαρῶς ἐπικαλουμένων, ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ φαινόμενος καὶ γινωσκόμενος τοῖς καθαροῖς πνεύμασιν, ὁ ἐπὶ γῆς ὑμνούμενος καὶ κατοικῶν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων ἁγίων λειτουργούμενος καὶ καθαρῶν ψυχῶν, ὁ ποιήσας καὶ ἐξ οὐρανῶν χορὸν ζῶντα εἰς δόξαν καὶ αἶνον τῆς ἀληθείας· δὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ταύτην ζῶσαν καὶ καθαρὰν ἐκκλησίαν εἶναι, δὸς αὐτὴν ἔχειν θείας δυνάμεις καὶ καθαροὺς ἀγγέλους λειτουργούς, ἵνα δυνηθῇ καθαρῶς ὑμνεῖν σε. παρακαλοῦμεν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἐκκλησίας ταύτης· πᾶσιν καταλλάγηθι, πᾶσιν συγχώρησον, πᾶσιν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων δός· χάρισαι μηκέτι μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνειν, ἀλλὰ γενοῦ τεῖχος αὐτοῖς καὶ κατάργησον πάντα πειρασμόν· ἐλέησον ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παιδία καὶ φάνηθι ἐν πᾶσιν· καὶ γραφήτω σου ἡ γνῶσις ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ Ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (25)

Σὲ τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἐπικαλούμεθα, τὸν Θεὸν πάσης σαρκὸς καὶ κύριον παντὸς πνεύματος, τὸν εὐλογητὸν καὶ χορηγὸν πάσης εὐλογίας· ἁγίασον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τόνδε καὶ διατήρησον αὐτὸν ἔξω παντὸς πειρασμοῦ καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν, εὐόδωσον αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς σαῖς ἐπιστήμαις.

Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν συμπρεσβυτέρων, ἁγίασον αὐτούς, σοφίαν αὐτοῖς δὸς καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ὀρθὴν διδασκαλίαν· ποίησον αὐτοὺς πρεσβεύειν τὰς ἁγίας σου διδασκαλίας ὀρθῶς καὶ ἀμέμπτως.

Ἁγίασον δὲ καὶ διακόνους, ἵνα ὦσιν καθαροὶ καρδίᾳ καὶ σώματι καὶ δυνηθῶσιν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λειτουργεῖν καὶ παραστῆναι τῷ ἁγίῳ σώματι καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ αἵματι.

Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑποδιακόνων καὶ ἀναγνωστῶν καὶ ἑρμηνέων· πάντας τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ⟨λειτουργοὺς⟩ ἀνάπαυσον καὶ πᾶσιν δὸς ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν καὶ προκοπήν.

Δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν μοναζόντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν παρθενευουσῶν· τελεσάτωσαν τὸν δρόμον ἑαυτῶν ἀμέμπτως καὶ τὸν βίον ἑαυτῶν

---

4 Ecclus. xxxvi 19; Num. xvi 22. 17 Heb. viii 10. 22 Num. xvi 22.
31 Mt. v 8. 32 1 Tim. iii 9; 2 Tim. i 3. 36 2 Tim. i 16. 38 2 Tim. iv 7.

ἀδιαλείπτως, ἵνα δυνηθῶσιν ἐν καθαρότητι διατρῖψαι καὶ ἁγιότητι τὰς ἡμέρας ἑαυτῶν πάσας.

Ἐλέησον δὲ καὶ τοὺς γεγαμηκότας πάντας, τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τὰ γύναια καὶ τὰ παιδία, καὶ δὸς πᾶσιν εὐλογίαν προκοπῆς καὶ βελτιώσεως, ἵνα πάντες γένωνται ζῶντες καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄνθρωποι.

Διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Εὐχὴ γονυκλισίας (26)

Πάτερ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ἀγαθὲ καὶ οἰκτίρμον, ἐλεῆμον καὶ φιλάνθρωπε καὶ φιλόψυχε, εὐεργέτα πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ σὲ ἐπιστρεφόντων, δέχου τὴν παράκλησιν ταύτην καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν γνῶσιν καὶ πίστιν καὶ εὐσέβειαν καὶ ὁσιότητα. κατάργησον πᾶν πάθος, πᾶσαν ἡδονήν, πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου· ποίησον πάντας γενέσθαι καθαρούς· συγχώρησον πᾶσιν τὰ πλημμελήματα. σοὶ γὰρ τῷ ἀγενήτῳ Πατρὶ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς κλίνομεν τὸ γόνυ, δὸς ἡμῖν νοῦν ὅσιον καὶ τελείαν ὠφέλειαν, δὸς ἡμᾶς σὲ ζητεῖν καὶ ἀγαπᾶν, δὸς ἡμῖν ἐρευνᾶν καὶ ἐκζητεῖν τὰ θεῖά σου λόγια, δὸς ἡμῖν χεῖρα δέσποτα καὶ ἀνάστησον ἡμᾶς· ἀνάστησον ὁ Θεὸς τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, ποίησον ἀναβλέπειν· ἀνακάλυψον ἡμῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, παρρησίαν ἡμῖν χάρισαι, μὴ ἐπιτρέψῃς ἡμᾶς αἰσχύνεσθαι μηδὲ δυσωπεῖσθαι μηδὲ καταγινώσκειν ἑαυτῶν· ἐξάλειψον τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον, γράψον ἡμῶν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς, συναρίθμησον ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἁγίοις σου προφήταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE KISS OF PEACE⟩

. . . .

⟨THE OFFERTORY⟩

. . . .

⟨THE ANAPHORA⟩

Εὐχὴ Προσφόρου Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου (1)

Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιόν ἐστιν σὲ τὸν ἀγένητον Πατέρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰνεῖν ὑμνεῖν δοξολογεῖν. αἰνοῦμεν σὲ ἀγένητε Θεὲ ἀνεξιχνίαστε ἀνέκφραστε ἀκατανόητε πάσῃ γενητῇ

---

1 Luc. i 75. 10 Ps. lxxxv 15. 11 Sap. xi 26. 22 Col. ii 14.
23 Phil. iv 3; Apoc. xiii 8. 24 Eph. iii 5.

ὑποστάσει. αἰνοῦμεν σὲ τὸν γιγνωσκόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, τὸν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ λαληθέντα καὶ ἑρμηνευθέντα καὶ γνωσθέντα τῇ γενητῇ φύσει. αἰνοῦμεν σὲ τὸν γιγνώσκοντα τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ ἀποκαλύπτοντα τοῖς ἁγίοις τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξας· τὸν γιγνωσκόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ γεγεννημένου σου Λόγου καὶ ὁρώμενον καὶ διερμηνευόμενον τοῖς ἁγίοις. αἰνοῦμεν σὲ Πάτερ ἀόρατε, χορηγὲ τῆς ἀθανασίας. σὺ εἶ ἡ πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς, ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ φωτός, ἡ πηγὴ πάσης χάριτος καὶ πάσης ἀληθείας, φιλάνθρωπε καὶ φιλόπτωχε, ὁ πᾶσιν καταλλασσόμενος καὶ πάντας πρὸς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου Υἱοῦ ἕλκων. δεόμεθα ποίησον ἡμᾶς ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους· δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα φωτός, ἵνα γνῶμεν σὲ τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· δὸς ἡμῖν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν ἐξειπεῖν καὶ διηγήσασθαι τὰ ἄρρητά σου μυστήρια. λαλησάτω ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ ὑμνησάτω σὲ δι᾽ ἡμῶν.

Σὺ γὰρ ὁ ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυ⟨νά⟩μεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι· σοὶ παραστήκουσι χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες ἀγγέλων ἀρχαγγέλων θρόνων κυριοτήτων ἀρχῶν ἐξουσιῶν· σοὶ παραστήκουσιν τὰ δύο τιμιώτατα σεραφεὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα, δυσὶν μὲν πτέρυξιν καλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, δυσὶ δὲ τοὺς πόδας, δυσὶ δὲ πετόμενα, καὶ ἁγιάζοντα· μεθ᾽ ὧν δέξαι καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον ἁγιασμὸν λεγόντων

Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος Κύριος σαβαώθ
πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου.

Πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ οὐρανός, πλήρης ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς σου δόξης Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων· πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς σῆς μεταλήψεως· σοὶ γὰρ προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ἀναίμακτον.

Σοὶ προσηνέγκαμεν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς. ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος τοῦ ἁγίου σώματός ἐστιν ὁμοίωμα, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ᾗ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἑαυτοῦ λέγων· Λάβετε καὶ φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου ποιοῦντες τὸν ἄρτον προσηνέγκαμεν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν διὰ τῆς

---

1 Luc. x 22; Mt. xi 27, xvi 17. 7 Jer. ii 13. 8 Jo. i 14. 9 Jo. xii 32.
11 Jo. xvii 3. 16 Eph. i 21. 18 Dan. vii 10. 19 Col. i 16.
20 Is. vi 2, 3. 26 2 Pet. i 17. 27 Ps. lxxxiii 1. 29 Rom. xii 1.
33 1 Cor. xi 23, 24; Mc. viii 6; Luc. xxii 19; Mt. xxvi 26. 36 Rom. vi 5.

θυσίας ταύτης καταλλάγηθι πᾶσιν ἡμῖν καὶ ἱλάσθητι Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας· καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ἐσκορπισμένος ἦν ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθεὶς ἐγένετο εἰς ἕν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν σύναξον ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ πάσης χώρας καὶ πάσης πόλεως καὶ κώμης καὶ οἴκου καὶ ποίησον μίαν ζῶσαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Προσηνέγκαμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ αἵματος, ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς λαβὼν ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ἔλεγεν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς· Λάβετε πίετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, ὅ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων. διὰ τοῦτο προσηνέγκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίωμα αἵματος προσάγοντες.

Ἐπιδημησάτω Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ ἅγιός σου Λόγος ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα γένηται τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς Ἀληθείας. καὶ ποίησον πάντας τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας φάρμακον ζωῆς λαβεῖν εἰς θεραπείαν παντὸς νοσήματος καὶ εἰς ἐνδυνάμωσιν πάσης προκοπῆς καὶ ἀρετῆς, μὴ εἰς κατάκρισιν Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας μηδὲ εἰς ἔλεγχον καὶ ὄνειδος.

⟨THE INTERCESSION⟩

Σὲ γὰρ τὸν ἀγένητον ἐπεκαλεσάμεθα διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· ἐλεηθήτω ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, προκοπῆς ἀξιωθήτω, ἀποσταλήτωσαν ἄγγελοι συμπαρόντες τῷ λαῷ εἰς κατάργησιν τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὧν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ ἀνάμνησις—

(*the Diptychs of the Dead are recited*)

μετὰ τὴν ὑποβολὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων

ἁγίασον τὰς ψυχὰς ταύτας, σὺ γὰρ πάσας γινώσκεις· ἁγίασον πάσας τὰς ἐν Κυρίῳ κοιμηθείσας καὶ συγκαταρίθμησον πάσαις ταῖς ἁγίαις σου δυνάμεσιν καὶ δὸς αὐτοῖς τόπον καὶ μονὴν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

Δέξαι δὲ καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εὐλόγησον τοὺς προσενεγκόντας τὰ πρόσφορα καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας καὶ χάρισαι ὑγείαν καὶ ὁλοκληρίαν καὶ εὐθυμίαν καὶ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ὅλῳ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.

---

1 Ps. xxx 6. 8 1 Cor. xi 23-25; Mt. xxvi 27, 28; Luc. xxii 20. 13 Ps. xxx 6.
18 1 Cor. xi 34; Ps. xxx 6. 30 Apoc. xiv 13.

⟨*The People*⟩

Ὥσπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστὶν καὶ ἔσται εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE FRACTION⟩

Μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἡ Κλάσις καὶ ἐν τῇ κλάσει εὐχή (2)

Καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ ταύτης Θεὲ ΤΗ͂Ϲ ἈΛΗΘΕΊΑϹ καὶ ποίησον τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν χωρῆσαι ἁγνείαν καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς φρόνησιν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ σόφισον ἡμᾶς Θεὲ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν διὰ τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος· ὅτι διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE LORD'S PRAYER⟩

. . . .

⟨THE COMMUNION⟩

The Clergy communicate.

Μετὰ τὸ διαδοῦναι τὴν κλάσιν τοῖς κληρικοῖς Χειροθεσία λαοῦ (3)

Ἐκτείνω τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ δέομαι ἐκταθῆναι τὴν τῆς Ἀληθείας χεῖρα καὶ δοθῆναι εὐλογίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ διὰ τὴν σὴν φιλανθρωπίαν Θεὲ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τὰ παρόντα· χεὶρ εὐλαβείας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ καὶ καθαρότητος καὶ πάσης ὁσιότητος εὐλογησάτω τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ διατηρησάτω εἰς προκοπὴν καὶ βελτίωσιν· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ⟨τοὺς⟩ σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

The People communicate

Μετὰ τὴν διά⟨δο⟩σιν τοῦ λαοῦ εὐχή (4)

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι δέσποτα ὅτι ἐσφαλμένους ἐκάλεσας καὶ ἡμαρτηκότας προσεποιήσω καὶ ὑπερτέθεισαι τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν ἀπειλήν, φιλανθρωπίᾳ τῇ σῇ συγχωρήσας καὶ τῇ μετανοίᾳ ἀπαλείψας καὶ τῇ πρὸς σὲ γνώσει ἀποβαλών. εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι δέδωκας ἡμῖν ΚΟΙΝΩΝΊΑΝ ϹΏΜΑΤΟϹ καὶ ΑἽΜΑΤΟϹ. εὐλόγησον ἡμᾶς, εὐλόγησον τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, ποίησον ἡμᾶς μέρος ἔχειν μετὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦ⟨ς⟩ σου Υἱοῦ δι' οὗ σοῦ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

---

6 Ps. xxx 6. 31 1 Cor. x 16.

Εὐχὴ περὶ τῶν προσφερομένων ἐλαίων καὶ ὑδάτων (5)

Εὐλογοῦμεν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ μονογενοῦ⟨ς⟩ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ κτίσμα⟨τα⟩ ταῦτα, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ παθόντος ὀνομάζομεν, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος καὶ ἀναστάντος καὶ καθεζομένου ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ ἀγενήτου, ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπὶ ⟨τὸ⟩ ἔλαιον τοῦτο· χάρισαι δύναμιν θεραπευτικὴν ἐπὶ τὰ κτίσματα ταῦτα, ὅπως πᾶς πυρετὸς καὶ πᾶν δαιμόνιον καὶ πᾶσα νόσος διὰ τῆς πόσεως καὶ τῆς ἀλείψεως ἀπαλλαγῇ, καὶ γένηται φάρμακον θεραπευτικὸν καὶ φάρμακον ὁλοκληρίας ἡ τῶν κτισμάτων τούτων μετάληψις ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ μονογενοῦ⟨ς⟩ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Χειροθεσία μετὰ τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ τοῦ ἐλαίου (6)

Φιλάνθρωπε Θεὲ ΤΗ͂C ἀΛΗΘΕΊΑC *συμπαραμεινάτω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἡ* ΚΟΙΝΩΝΊΑ ΤΟΥ͂ CΏΜΑΤΟC *καὶ* ΤΟΥ͂ ΑἿΜΑΤΟC· *τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ζῶντα ἔστω σώματα καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ αὐτῶν καθαραὶ ἔστωσαν ψυχαί. δὸς τὴν εὐλογίαν ταύτην εἰς τήρησιν τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ εἰς ἀσφάλειαν τῆς γενομένης εὐχαριστίας, καὶ μακάρισον κοινῇ πάντας καὶ ποίησον ἐκλεκτούς· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦ⟨ς⟩ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.*

14 Ps. xxx 6. 15 1 Cor. x 16.

NOTES.

In the text obvious omissions are supplied between pointed brackets; mere itacisms are silently corrected; other emendations are indicated in the notes. Accentuation and punctuation, which are slight and inconstant in the MS, have been supplied.

P. 99, l. 4. Εὐχὴ πρώτη. Cp. *Lit. St. Mark* (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 117).

l. 14. *δέ*: Wobbermin perhaps rightly corrects to *σέ*.

l. 16. *ὠφεληθῶσιν*: MS *ὠφελησθῶσιν*?

l. 17. *διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς κ.τ.λ.* S. Athanasius has *τῷ . . . διὰ . . . ἐν* in doxologies, c. A.D. 317 in *de incarn. Verbi* 57 (i 97), 356 in *ad episc. Egypt. et Lib.* 23 (i 294), c. 357 in *de fuga* 27 (i 337) and *hist. Arian.* 80 (i 393); and *σύμπαντας αἰῶνας* in *expos. Fid.* 4 (i 102) and *ad episc. Egypt. et Lib. l. c.*: S. Isai. Ab. *Orat.* xiv (Migne *P. G.* xl 114) in omnia saecula saeculorum. Ἡ *δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος* (1 Pet. iv 11) is perhaps more habitual in Egypt than elsewhere; see Origen, Ath., and the Liturgies, *passim.*

l. 20. *Lections and Sermon.* St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 6 (p. 179) τοῖς ἀναγνώσμασι καὶ ταῖς ψαλμῳδίαις, where the ref. is probably to the lections and the intercalated psalms of the mass (cp. *Constt. app.* ii 54, 57). Origen *c. Cels.* iii 50 (i 480) οἱ καὶ δι' ἀναγνωσμάτων καὶ διὰ τῶν εἰς αὐτὰ διηγήσεων προτρέποντες μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων εὐσέβειαν κ.τ.λ.

l. 22. **μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι.** Cf. Origen *in Num.* xx 5 (ii 352) et ideo surgentes oremus &c.; *in Esai.* iii 3 (iii 111); *in Luc.* xxxvi (iii 976), xxxix (iii 979); [St. Ath.] *hom. de Semente* 17 (ii 72) ἀναστάντες καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκτείνωμεν τὰς χεῖρας κ.τ.λ. *Oremus* or *deprecemur* without *surgentes* in Origen *in Gen.* ii 6 (ii 66), *in Num.* xvi 9 (ii 334) both in the general sense of the present prayer; *in Num.* xxii 4 (ii 356), *in Jesu Nave* xvii 3 (ii 439), xx 6 (ii 447). For the African formula *Conversi ad Dominum*, see the cue in St. Aug. *Serm.* i, xviii, xxvi &c., and the full form in *Serm.* xxxiv, lxvii, cclxxii; St. Fulgent. *Serm.* x 10 (Migne *P. L.* lxv 750).

P. 100, l. 1. κτῆσαι . . . κτῆσαι. MS has κτίσαι in the second place and Wob. reads it in both. But κτῆσαι is probably right and is perhaps derived from Isa. xxvi 13 Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς. Cf. St. Ath. *c. Arian.* ii 14 ὥσπερ ὁ πάλαι λαὸς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βαρούμενος ἐστέναξεν οὕτω καὶ ἡμῶν ἐχόντων τὸν ἔμψυχον νόμον καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἀλαλήτους στεναγμοὺς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐντυγχανόντων καὶ λεγόντων **Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς**: St. Cyr. Al. *ep. ad Joan. Ant.* (V C 105 C) δεδιδάγμεθα δὲ καὶ λέγειν ἐν προσευχαῖς **Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰρήνην δὸς ἡμῖν** (the preceding context of the above): the whole passage is found in the Egyptian lit. (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 126, 166).

l. 8. MS χειραν.

l. 14. MS γινώσκουσιν.

l. 29. The distinction of masses is implied in Origen *in Exod.* xiii 3 (ii 176), *in Lev.* ix 10 (ii 243); St. Didym. *de Trin.* iii 21 (p. 398) ἴσασιν δὲ οἱ τοῦ ἀκροτάτου καὶ διαιωνίου μυστηρίου καταξιωθέντες ὃ λέγω: and the dismissal in St. Ath. *ap. c. Arian.* 28 (i 148 A) πῶς οἷόν τε ἦν προσφορὰν προκεῖσθαι ἔνδον ὄντων τῶν κατηχουμένων: cf. 11, 46; *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Can. eccles.* 43 (Lagarde *Aegyptiaca* p. 253; Tattam *Ap. Const.* p. 50).

l. 31. With the following series of petitions cp. the Egyptian formulae in *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 119, 157–159, 221.

l. 33. ἐξομολογούμεθα, MS -μεσθα, but perhaps corrected.

P. 101, l. 10. καταλλάγηθι πᾶσιν, cp. pp. 102. 12, 103. 13, 105. 9, 106. 1; *Lit. St. Jas.* πᾶσιν ἡμῖν διαλλάγηθι (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 56); 2 Mac. i 5 καταλλαγείη ὑμῖν.

l. 14. Wob. wrongly inserts a colon after ἐχέτωσαν and makes ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως a new petition. Cp. *Lit. St. Chrys.* δὸς αὐτοῖς Κύριε εἰρηνικὸν τὸ βασίλειον ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ γαλήνῃ αὐτῶν ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 333); *St. Bas.* λάλησον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου (*ib.*, and cp. p. 128 borrowed from *St. Bas.*).

l. 21. With this petition cp. the current Egyptian forms (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 119, 127, 157, 167, 221, 229).

l. 21. ἄγγελον εἰρηνικόν. Cp. St. Chrys. *adv. Jud.* iii 6 (i 614 C), *in Ascens.* 1 (ii 448 D; in *Litt. E. and W.* p. 478), Byzant. Lit. (*ib.* pp. 381, 391, adopted in *St. Jas. ib.* p. 39): *Constt. ap.* viii 36 sq.

l. 22. μηδέν: MS and Wob. μηδένα: but the α which is separated from the ν is perhaps an unerased mistake for the following υ.

l. 26. ἐξένεγκον: MS and Wob. have ἐξενεγκών, but the form of the sentence seems to require an imperative, and perhaps the unusual form ἐξένεγκον is meant.

l. 28. Cp. the Egyptian forms in *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 119, 126, 157, 166, 221.

l. 31. κύριος καὶ βασιλεύς seems to be a familiar Egyptian expression, since St. Ath. in discussing Acts ii 36 in *c. Arian.* ii 12–18 constantly substitutes it for κύριον καὶ χριστόν.

l. 36. This blessing is not found in current Egyptian forms; but cp. Syrian in *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 12, 30, 44, 84; Nestorian, *ib.* 267; Armenian, *ib.* 429.

P. 102, l. 8. This prayer and blessing of the sick does not occur elsewhere.

l. 13. βοήθησον: the MS and Wob. read βοήθησαι, probably by assimilation to ἴασαι following.

l. 15. δὸς δόξαν: perhaps a re-rendering of Copt. *maōou* = δόξασον in St. Jo. xii 28 (where however the Coptic reads ‘son’ for ‘name’).

l. 28. τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν ἀστέρων: Philo *de mund. opif.* 45; St. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* 20 § 3; St. Ath. *c. Arian.* ii 19; *Ap. Constt.* viii 12 and *Lit. St. Mark* (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 15, 137).

l. 30. χαρισάμενος . . . πεπλασμένῳ, the Bp. of Salisbury’s emendation for χρησάμενος . . . πεπαλαιωμένῳ of the MS and Wob.

l. 36. τὴν ἁγίαν σου κ.τ.λ. Cp. St. Alex. Al. ap. Theodt. *H. E.* i 4 μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν: *Lit. St. Mark* τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μόνης καθ. καὶ ἀποστ. ἐκκλ. (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 126: cp. 150, 160, 165 sq. and the Coptic rites *passim*).

P. 103, l. 10. ζῶσαν . . . ἐκκλησίαν: cp. p. 106. 5 and 2 Clem. 14 § 2 ἐκκλησία ζῶσα σῶμά ἐστιν Χριστοῦ.

l. 23. MS χορητον.

l. 24. τόνδε: hence this passage is not episcopal.

l. 27. συμπρεσβυτέρων need not imply that the bishop is reckoned among the presbyters, but may mean either ‘the college of presbyters,’ or the ‘fellow presbyters’ of the reciter of the prayer.

l. 32. MS τῶι (iota adscript).

l. 35. ἑρμηνέων: see below on Ordinations. λειτουργούς is Wob.’s suggested addition.

l. 37. MS *παρθερθενευουσῶν*, where *θερ* is obviously an unerased mistake for *θεν* following. Wob. reads impossibly *τῶν παρθένων εὖ οὐσῶν.*

l. 38. *τελεσάτωσαν* is added partly in and partly above the line, but not apparently by a later hand, as Wob. The quotation from 2 Tim. is used in a similar connexion by St. Serapion *Ep. ad Monachos* 15 (Migne *P. G.* xl 941 B).

P. 104, l. 9. **Εὐχὴ γονυκλισίας.** The ektene of the faithful was said kneeling or prostrate in the Syrian rite (*Litt. E and W.* pp. 9, 472), but the congregation rose for the following prayer (*ib.* 12, 473). This prayer, probably preceded by a deacon's bidding (cp. *ib.* 159), may correspond. Or it may be an original 'Prayer of the veil' (*ib.* 158).

l. 18. *ἐρευνᾶν* is apparently right, but the middle letters are difficult to read in the MS, where there appears to be a correction.

l. 18. *δὸς ἡμῖν χεῖρα κ.τ.λ.* Cp. the ninth prayer in the Coptic admission of a catechumen, Assemani *Cod. Lit.* i p. 151 'give us thine hand, O Lord, and raise us up from the earth.' Or *δὸς χεῖρα* may be a mere copticism, *matot* = *βοήθησον.*

l. 21. MS *ἐπιστρεψης.*

l. 28. *Kiss of Peace.* Mentioned in Clem. Al. *Paed.* iii 11 § 81; Origen *in Cantic. cantic.* i (iii 37 F) cuius rei imago est illud osculum quod in ecclesia sub tempore mysteriorum nobis invicem damus: *in Rom.* x 33 (iv 683 C); Tim. Al. *Respons. canon.* 9 (Migne *P. G.* xxxiii 1302 C) *ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἀναφορᾷ ὁ διάκονος προσφωνεῖ πρὸ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ Οἱ ἀκοινώνητοι περιπατήσατε.* Cp. *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Canones eccles.* 43 (Lagarde *Aegyptiaca* p. 253; Tattam *App. Constt.* p. 50).

l. 30. *Offertory.* St. Ath. *ap. c. Arian.* 28 *προσφορὰν προκεῖσθαι* (quoted above): cp. *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Can. eccles.* 46 (Lagarde, p. 255; Tattam, p. 52); *Ethiop. Ch. Ord.* (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 189). The people offered the *πρόσφορα* p. 106. 33: for mixed chalice see Clem. Al. *Strom.* i 19 § 96.

l. 32. The opening dialogue of the anaphora is given in *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Can. eccles.* 31 (Lagarde, p. 249; Tattam, p. 32; *Litt. E. and W.* p. 463: cp. 189) where it is identical with that of all the Egyptian rites, Greek, Coptic, and Ethiopic, except St. Gregory, and with that of the Roman rite.

l. 33. *προσφόρου*: cp. p. 106. 34. I have not found the form *πρόσφορον* elsewhere.

l. 36. *πάσῃ γενητῇ ὑποστάσει, γεν. φύσει.* Cp. Alex. Al. in Thdt. *H. E.* i 4 (p. 18) *τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ πάσῃ γενητῇ φύσει ἀπεριεργάστου τυγχανούσης*: Ath. *ep. ad Serap.* i 17.

P. 105, l. 5. MS *γεγεν̄ημένου* (not *γεγενημ.* as Wob.).

l. 16. *Σὺ γὰρ ὁ κ.τ.λ.* See *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 131, 175. Cp. St. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* 34 § 6 *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ Μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστή-*

κεισαν αὐτῷ καὶ χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκέκραγον Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος Κύριος σαβαώθ· πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. St. Ath. *in illud Omnia* 6 (i 108 C) τὰ τίμια ζῶα προσφέρειν τὴν δοξολογίαν Ἅγιος κ.τ.λ.; and *ib.* (108 B) ἁγιασμός in the present sense. Cp. Origen *c. Cels.* viii 34 (i 766 F).

l. 18. MS παραστήσουσι.

l. 24. This form of the *sanctus* is occasionally quoted (St. Cyr. Al. *in Abac.* iii [iii 555 A]: St. Chrys. *in illud Vidi* i 3 [vi 98 E]; St. Jo. Damasc. *de Trisagio* 2 [i 482 C]); but elsewhere (*in Col.* ix 2 [xi 393 D]) Chrys. treats the *sanctus* as a mystery, ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοί. The later Egyptian *sanctus* has ἁγίας σου δόξης (3 Childr. 30: *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 132, 176, 231).

l. 26. πλήρης ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ. See *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 132, 176.

l. 33. Cp. the Institution in *Lit. St. Mark* (*ib.*).

l. 37. ποιοῦντες (Luc. xxii 19) answers to προσάγοντες p. 106. 12 (Lev. v 8).

P. 106, l. 2. MS τοῦτος. *Didache* ix 4 ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν. Cp. *Ap. Constt.* vii 25; [Ath.] *de Virginit.* 13 (ii 117); St. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiii 13.

l. 9. λάβετε. Clem. Al. *Paed.* ii 2 § 32 (p. 186); Origen *in Jer.* xii 2 (iii 194); some Copt. MSS of N. T. in Matt. xxvi 27 (also some Syr. and Lat. authorities): *Litt. Copt.* (Renaudot *L. O. C.* i pp. 15, 30, 66; *Litt. E. and W.* 177, 232).

l. 13. This form of Invocation is perhaps illustrated by St. Iren. *Haer.* v 2 § 3 τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, where τὸν λόγον may be personal: cp. iv 18 § 5 ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν (Lat. *invocationem*) τοῦ Θεοῦ. The δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ of St. Justin M. *Apol.* i 66 cannot be parallel: the 'word of prayer' (cp. *ib.* 13) 'that is from Him' must be the liturgical thanksgiving derived from the εὐχαριστήσας of the Institution, which Justin proceeds to quote. Theophilus of Alexandria *Lib. pasch.* i (ap. S. Hieron. *ep.* xcviii 13) describes the consecration as effected 'per invocationem et adventum Spiritus sancti.'

l. 16. φάρμακον. St. Ignat. *Eph.* 20 ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας; cp. *Litt. E. and W.* p. 192.

l. 23. MS κατηργησιν.

l. 28. μετὰ τὴν ὑποβολήν. MS and Wob. treat this as part of the text of the prayer, but it is obviously a rubric. The names would be normally 'submitted' by the deacon; but I know of no Egyptian allusions to the diptychs in the fourth century. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 128 sq., 169 sq.

l. 33. Δέξαι δὲ κ.τ.λ. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 129, 170—where notice that the commemoration of the offerers still follows immediately that of the dead.

P. 107, l. 2. Cf. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 134, 180, 190, 233, 96 (prob. borrowed from Egypt). For the *Amen* see St. Dionys. Al. *ep. ad S. Xystum* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii 9 εὐχαριστίας γὰρ ἐπακούσαντα καὶ συνεπιφθεγξάμενον τὸ Ἀμήν. The whole may illustrate the τελευταία τῆς εὐχῆς συνεκφώνησις of Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii 7 § 40 (p. 854; but this may mean merely the Amen).

l. 4. *Prayer of Fraction.* Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 181, 234; Renaudot *L. O. C.* i pp. 19, 34, 71, 105.

l. 10. Wob. omits καί before νῦν.

l. 12. *The Lord's Prayer.* See *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 136, 182, 234: in the *Eth. Ch. Ord.* the Lord's Prayer obviously follows 'Pray ye,' *ib.* p. 191.

l. 16. The MS reads διαδοῦναι not, as Wob., διδοῦναι.

l. 17. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 137, 183, 191, 235.

l. 25. *Communion.* St. Dionys. Al. *ep. ad S. Xystum* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii 9 τραπέζῃ παραστάντα καὶ χεῖρας εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τῆς ἁγίας τροφῆς προτεινάντα καὶ ταύτην παραδεξάμενον κ.τ.λ. The form of communion is given in the *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Canones eccles.* 46, 'This is the bread of heaven, the body of Christ Jesus. ℟ Amen. This is the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord. ℟ Amen' (Lagarde, p. 258; Tattam, p. 64; *Litt. E. and W.* p. 464).

l. 26. MS διασῑ.

l. 27. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 141, 186, 192, 242.

l. 32. μέρος ἔχειν μετά is generally used of communion with persons. Origen *in Jer.* xiv 14 (iii 217) πολλάκις ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς λέγομεν Θεὲ παντοκράτορ τὴν μερίδα ἡμῖν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν δός κ.τ.λ. (cp. Col. i 12); *Lit. St. Mk.* δὸς ἡμῖν μερίδα καὶ κλῆρον ἔχειν μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 129); *Can. Rom.* in *Nobis quoque*: partem aliquam et societatem donare digneris cum tuis sanctis apostolis et martyribus.

P. 108, l. 1. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* p. 190; Achelis *Canones Hippolyti* in *Texte u. Unters.* vi 4 p. 56.

l. 14. Cp. *Litt. E. and W.* pp. 142, 187, 192, 243.

l. 14. Wob. has read wrongly συμπαραβεινάτω.

F. E. Brightman.

(*To be continued*)

NOTES

THE PHILIPPIANS AND THEIR MAGISTRATES.

[Professor Ramsay has kindly allowed the following note, written in answer to a question addressed to him, to be printed in the *Journal of Theological Studies.*—Ed.]

1. ON THE TITLE OF THE MAGISTRATES AT PHILIPPI (Acts xvi 19–22).

The title of the supreme board of magistrates in the *Colonia Philippensium* is not certain. As Professor Pelham points out to me, it is not impossible that Philippi may have been one of those *coloniae* in which the supreme magistrates were called *praetores*. This is one of the many questions in which we must wait for excavation to give certainty.

The probability, however, is that the *colonia* had *duo viri* for its chief magistrates; but even in such cases courtesy permitted the more honorific title to be substituted. But apart from any question of mere courtesy, it is by no means easy to render the Latin title in Greek.

The Latin *duumvir*, *duo viri*, are with strict technical accuracy rendered in Greek by δυανδρικός, δύο ἄνδρες: δυανδρικός is so used at *Col. Caes. Antiocheia* or Pisidian Antioch (see inscription in Sterrett, *Epigraphic Journey*, 139, and *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3979[1]), δύο ἄνδρες *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 1186. But these were un-Greek renderings, obviously mere shifts to express a foreign title; compare δέκανδρος for *decemvir*, τριῶν ἀνδρῶν for *triumvirum*, &c. If one desired to have a real Greek word of literary type to express the Latin name, what would one use?

The board of supreme magistrates in a Greek city of the Roman period was called sometimes ἄρχοντες, sometimes στρατηγοί. It is established by indisputable examples that, at least in later time, these titles became interchangeable, so that the same person is called sometimes στρατηγός, sometimes ἄρχων; see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, pt. ii, p. 600 f. Perhaps in such a case we may understand that ἄρχων is the more general term, meaning 'member of the supreme board,' while στρατηγός was the more exact and precise designation of the board by its official title.

---

[1] Wrongly in text δυανερικός, and wrongly explained as = *duumviralis*; it is = *duumvir*, which in singular is hard to express in Greek. Sterrett gives the correct form.

On this analogy the Greek-speaking peoples used both terms to express *duumvir*, *duo viri*, as is pointed out by S. Reinach, *Manuel d'Épigraphie Grecque*, p. 527. ἄρχοντες is used in a Greek rendering of a decree of entirely Latin form at Naples (a *colonia* with *duo viri*), *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 5836; but the example which he gives for the use of στρατηγοί (*Lebas-Waddington*, 2597) from Palmyra is not sufficient, and merely proves that at Palmyra there was a board of two στρατηγοί: in fact, Palmyra was not organized on the Italian style, and in that very inscription the βουλή and δῆμος are mentioned, implying Greek organization. A clear case, however, occurs in Pisidian Antioch, Sterrett, *Epigraphic Journey*, 96, ἡ βουλὴ τὸν Σεκοῦνδον ἐπὶ τῇ στρατηγίᾳ. Here the *ordo* of that *colonia* is called βουλή, and it seems beyond question that Secundus was honoured as having filled the office of *duumvir*. It is remarkable that Greek was used in this case, for Latin is the ordinary language of Antiochian inscriptions, even of private inscriptions, much more of an official inscription like this. Yet we are apparently precluded by the Latin name Secundus from dating this inscription in pre-Roman times.

It was therefore quite possible for a Greek writer like Luke to hesitate whether he should use ἄρχοντες or στρατηγοί for the chief magistrates of a *colonia*; and so evidently Luke did, Acts xvi 19, 20. Here he says the same thing twice over, 'dragged them into the agora before the archons,' and 'brought them to the presence of the strategoi.' It is unquestionable that these two clauses are two variants, one of more literary and Greek character, the second, presumably, more technical. Luke had not decided between them, and the existence of both in the text is a proof that the book had not here received its final form (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 217). It is quite possible in Greek to use either ἄρχοντες or στρατηγοί to designate the *duo viri*; but it is hardly possible to use both in one sentence to designate the same persons.

But, further, στρατηγός was the regular Greek translation for the Latin *praetor*. Examples are too many and familiar to need quoting.

It is, therefore, not possible to say with certainty what was the intention in Luke's mind as regards Philippi and its magistrates. He may have intended to use στρατηγοί as the regular translation of *praetores*, meaning that the supreme magistrates were so called (either by courtesy or because they were so strictly); or he may have intended to use στρατηγοί in a more general way as a common Greek title for 'the supreme board of magistrates.' Each is a possible view.

But the probability is, (1) the magistrates at Philippi were *duo viri*, called in courtesy *praetores*: (2) Luke used στρατηγοί as the regular Greek translation of *praetores*: (3) he did for a moment hesitate, when first he mentioned these magistrates, whether in more literary style to call them by the general term 'magistrates' (ἄρχοντες), or to use the more technical translation of their title (στρατηγοί); and he wrote both, but decided for the second, and kept it throughout the rest of the story: (4) the rejected term ἄρχοντες has been preserved owing to the book not having received the finishing touches. And that is the view taken in *St. Paul the Traveller*, leaving the other possibilities unnoticed. Whether it is right, or needs to be modified, excavation will determine. Here is one of the many cases in which the progress of discovery must be patiently waited.

2. ON THE GREEK FORM OF THE NAME PHILIPPIANS.

It is worth noticing that St. Paul uses the technical and un-Greek rendering of the city name. He speaks of Φιλιππήσιοι, which is a *monstrum* in Greek, being merely the transcription of *Philippenses*. A writer who kept to literary Greek might use Φιλιππεῖς or Φιλιππηνοί: Stephanus Byz. says that Polybius uses the latter, implying apparently that the former was (as we should expect) the ordinary Greek form. The suffix -ήσιος was only used in Greek to reproduce Latin names, as Μουτουνήσιος for *Mutinensis*, &c. St. Paul, therefore, regarded Colonia Augusta Julia Victrix Philippensium (Head, *Historia Numorum*, p. 192) as a Latin town, and marks this by the name, which implies doubtless that the inhabitants were proud of their rank (as all colonies in the provinces naturally were), and he respected courteously a justifiable feeling in his correspondents.

This is one of the little noticed indications of Paul's preference for technical Latin forms to indicate Roman administrative ideas: compare Ἰλλυρικόν for the Roman province. The regular Greek for *Illyricum* was Ἰλλυρίς, and even Ptolemy uses it when describing the Roman province. Paul and Dion Cassius (twice) are the only writers that render the Latin term in the most severely technical form; and Dion was a Roman historian.

W. M. Ramsay.

SOME NEW MEMBERS OF THE 'FERRAR GROUP' OF MSS OF THE GOSPELS.

The history of the criticism of the Ferrar group of New Testament MSS is somewhat sharply marked by three publications.

There is first of all Ferrar and Abbott's edition in 1877, which reconstructed in a tentative manner the archetype of the group, and proved beyond doubt that the four MSS 13, 69, 124, 346, which are the primary members of the group, have a common ancestor of an early and interesting type.

Secondly, there is the Abbé Martin's pamphlet, *Quatre manuscrits importants* (Paris, 1886), which localized three out of the four MSS in Calabria or possibly Sicily. And lastly there is Dr. Rendel Harris' tract, *The origin of the Ferrar group*, which pointed out that a Syriac element is proved in this group by (1) the stichometric reckoning of ῥήματα; (2) various readings which seem to be due to retranslation from the Syriac, and, moreover, from a Syriac which was influenced by Tatian's Diatessaron.

Both the Abbé Martin and Dr. Rendel Harris also draw attention to other MSS which may possibly belong to this group, the former instancing 348 and 211, while the latter suggests an examination of all the MSS, which, at the end of each Gospel, add the number of ῥήματα[1].

During a recent visit to Italy I found it possible to do a little towards following up these suggestions, by looking at 211, 826, and 828.

As to 211, a Graeco-Arabic MS of the twelfth century now at Venice, I can only claim a secondhand knowledge. I had only time to glance at it myself, but a friend, Mr. Wathen, of Peterhouse, who was with me, kindly spent some little time over it, and made plain the following points:—

1. Postponing for a moment the consideration of the text, the external indications of affinity to the Ferrar group are exceedingly strong. It possesses the calculation by ῥήματα as well as by στίχοι, while the headings, both of Matthew and Mark, are ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Μ.; it also contains practically the same matter at the end as codd. 69, 346[2]. The τίτλοι are distinguished by the yellow transparent wash of ink which is characteristic of Calabrian MSS, and the menology contains Gregory of Agrigentum, though the other saints taken by the Abbé Martin as

---

[1] In his *Adversaria Critica* (Cambridge, 1893, pp. xvi–xxii, 1–59), Dr. Scrivener pointed out that 543 (Scr. 556), a twelfth-cent. MS bought in Epirus, and now belonging to the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, is another of the group.

[2] The list is given by Zacagni. The text of the description of the patriarchates as compared with the passages given by the Abbé Martin from 346 had sufficient variants to show that the relation with 346 is not the closest possible, though undoubted.

typical of a Calabrian or Sicilian source were not to be found. But no full collation of the menology could be made for lack of time. Coupled with the proved Calabrian origin of the other MSS of similar character, and with the fact that 211 is a Graeco-Arabic MS, there seems little reason for doubting the accuracy of the Abbé's suggestion that 211 was written in Calabria or Sicily, by either an Arabic scribe, or some writer or writers who were interested in Arab settlers in that district[1].

2. So far as the text goes the result is less certain and interesting. A collation of the *pericope adulterae* renders it hard to believe that there is no connexion, for it has practically no differences from the Ferrar group text[2]. But beyond this there is little sign of resemblance so far as a superficial examination showed. Taking the passages quoted[3] in Dr. Rendel Harris' monograph, only one was found to agree, and that imperfectly. This was Mc. viii 17, where the addition was found τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ὀλιγοπίστοις, which (with the obvious correction ὀλιγόπιστοι) is found in D 124 (13, 69, 346, 826, 828) lat vet syr-harcl *cum asterisco*. This is, according to Dr. Rendel Harris' probable hypothesis, due to the influence of Tatian, and is found in the Arabic harmony.

A collation of Mc. iii was made in order to see if there were grounds for thinking that the more violent peculiarities of the Ferrar group had been corrected, while small points had remained, but the result confirmed the absence of distinctively Ferrar elements. The only point of contact with the group is the addition of τὸν τελώνην in *v* 13, and this is not distinctive. But at the same time there were the significant readings τί ἔξεστιν in *v* 4, and the addition ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτὸν χ̅ν̅ αὐτὸν εἶναι in *v* 12. For the former (which is also found in the 1–209 group) is probably traceable to Tatian, being found in the Arabic, while the latter is only found elsewhere in C, 2^{pe}, and in a more or less modified form in the European Old Latin. There seems no direct evidence to connect it with Tatian, though it is clearly the kind of semi-harmonistic reading which might be expected.

The verdict on 211 must therefore be that in all probability it represents the work of two scribes, one a Calabrian Greek, the other a North African, who adopted much of the additional matter frequently connected with the Ferrar text as well as the reckoning of the ῥήματα. There is a somewhat less degree of probability for supposing that he knew the Ferrar text, but only used it in the *pericope adulterae*, preferring to use another text which seems to have had some curious readings perhaps connected with Tatian.

---

[1] I have not been able to find any definite Arab settlement to which this would point. Mr. Cowley and Mr. Gray tell me that the Arabic hand seems to them to be that of a North African.

[2] The single exception is λιθοβολεῖν in 211, where the Ferrar reading is λιθάζειν.

[3] These are Mt. xvii 5, Mc. ix 3, ix 28, Jo. xx 20, Mc. viii 17, Mt. i 16.

The interesting question remains for some Arabic scholar to settle, whether this Tatianic element is due to the influence of the Arabic text, and how far the Arabic text agrees with or differs from the Greek.

But if Venice did not add any MSS with a definitely Ferrar text, the reverse was true of the monastery of Grotta Ferrata, where owing to the kindness of Padre Rocchi, I was able to work for several hours. There are there two MSS. which I have little doubt will prove to be primary members of the group, and if the learned *bibliothecarius* be right in ascribing them to the eleventh century they are older than 13, 124, 346, and of course than 69. But I am bound to add that Gregory assigns them to the twelfth century, and the hands certainly reminded me strongly of the facsimile of cod. 13, though this may have been merely imagination, as I had no facsimile with me, nor have I a photograph of the Grotta Ferrata MSS.

They are:—Grotta Ferr. A. a. γ = Gregory 826, and Grotta Ferr. A. a. ε = Gregory 828. Both of them are clearly Calabrian MSS.

826, according to Gregory, has been partially collated by Mr. Simcox, but I do not know where his work can be seen: it would appear, however, that he only worked on St. Luke, but was satisfied that it was a Ferrar MS. As Gregory is silent on the point, he must have neglected to look at the subscriptions, which contain the ῥήματα after all as well as the στίχοι. It is noteworthy that this MS is free from the clerical error of 346, which reads at the end of John ,α̅π̅λ̅η̅ for ,α̅ϡ̅λ̅η̅ (13, 69, 124 are deficient). Also the beginning of Matthew is ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Μ. Precisely the same remarks apply to 828, except that the beginning and subscription of Matthew are wanting.

That the text of both MSS is that of the Ferrar group is, I think, certain. Both possessed (1) the transpositions of Jo. vii 53–viii 11 to Lc. xxi 38, and Lc. xxii 43, 44 to Mt. xxvi 39; (2) the reading ῷ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος Μαριὰμ ἐγέννησεν ι̅ν̅ τὸν λεγόμενον χ̅ν̅, otherwise only found in Greek in 346 and 543; (3) the addition καὶ ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτούς in Mc. ix 3, and all the other passages quoted by Dr. Rendel Harris, except in Jo. xx 20, where 828 agreed with the T. R.; (4) the subscriptions to the Gospels as follows:—(i) Εκ του κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιου εγραφη εβραιστι εν Παλαιστινι μετα η̅ ετη της αναληψεως του κ̅υ̅. εχει δε ρηματα ,β̅φ̅κ̅β̅ εχει δε στιχους ,β̅φ̅ξ̅. (ii) Ευαγγελιον κατα Μαρκον εγραφη ρωμαιστι εν ρωμη κατα ι̅β̅ ετη της αναληψεως του κ̅υ̅. εχει δε ρηματα ,α̅χ̅υ̅ε̅ στιχους αχιϛ. (iii) Ευαγγελιον κατα Λουκαν εγραφη ελληνιστι εις αλεξανδριαν την μεγαλην μετα ι̅ε̅ ετη της αναληψεως του κ̅υ̅. εχει δε ρηματα ,γ̅ω̅γ̅ στχχ ,β̅ψ̅κ̅. (iv) Ευα̅γ̅ εκ του κατα Ιω̅ εγραφη ελληνιστι εις εφεσον μετα ετη λ̅ της αναληψεως του κ̅υ̅. εχει δε ρηματα ,α̅ϡ̅λ̅η̅ εχει δε στιχους ,β̅κ̅δ̅ επι δομετιανου βασιλέως.

The text of both in the *pericope adulterae* is that of the Ferrars. But the impression borne on my mind from a hasty glance over a few pages was that 828 was slightly more true to the type in small points than 826. I could only quote Mc. iii 1–16 in proof of this, as I had no time to do much writing.

It only remains to add that the menology in either, if compared with the remarks in the Abbé Martin's book, is definitely Calabrian. 826 has very little menology left, but it contains St. Elias of Spilea, while the fragments in 828 supply all the other saints quoted by the Abbé except St. Marcellus.

It is highly probable then that there are at Grotta Ferrata two primary members of the Ferrar group, perhaps slightly earlier in date than any of the others. Whether a complete collation would do more than establish the already known readings of the group is of course a question which cannot be answered.

K. LAKE.

1. ON ΠΛΗΡΗΣ IN ST. JOHN i 14.

IT is given to few to restore from ancient authority at once the true reading and true interpretation of a passage in the New Testament, as Dr. Field restored καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα from Origen and St. Chrysostom in Marc. vii 19. The present note makes, in regard to a well-known passage in St. John's prologue, a similar appeal to an equally unnoticed catena of ancient authorities; but its scope is limited to questions of grammar and punctuation, and does not extend to the reading.

John i 14 runs as follows:—καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

Here πλήρης is an evident difficulty. What word does it agree with? Erasmus (see Wetstein, *ad loc.*) was so dissatisfied with any of the apparent alternatives that he connected the four words πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας with the succeeding verse Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ, as though it were the Baptist who is said to be 'full of grace and truth.' This interpretation need hardly be considered, and the field has been divided between those who, like Wetstein and Bishop Westcott, connect πλήρης directly with λόγος, making all the words from καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα to παρὰ πατρός parenthetical, and those who, with Meyer, Winer, Alford, Plummer, and others, simply sacrifice the grammar and connect it with αὐτοῦ. The latter method is obviously unsatisfactory; that the former is so too is shown by the number of those who adopt the second in preference to it.

The real explanation lies in the recognition of the indeclinable use of πλήρης, a use which no one appears to have noticed with two illustrious exceptions, Hort and Blass. Hort writes on Marc. iv 28 (Westcott and Hort, *New Testament: Appendix*, p. 24), 'This strange confusion [between πληρη σιτον, πληρες σιτον, πληρες σιτος, πληρης σιτος, πληρης σιτον] is easily explained if the original reading was πλήρης σῖτον, as in C* (apparently) and two good lectionaries. Πλήρης is similarly used as an indeclinable in the accusative in all good MSS of Acts vi 5 except B, and has good authority in the LXX.' Similarly Blass (*Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, p. 81; English translation, p. 81), with special reference to John i 14 (though it does not appear whether he does not after all prefer to construct the sentence with a parenthesis, and so keep πλήρης in the nominative)—'Hier kommt ein Wort in Frage, welches in merkwürdig grossem Umfange im N. T. und auch auf Papyrusurkunden indeklinabel erscheint: Act. vi 5 ἄνδρα πλήρης (-ρη B C^2) πίστεως: Act. vi 3 πλήρεις (-ρης A E H P) πνεύματος: Act. xix 28 γενόμενοι πλήρεις (-ρης A E L) θυμοῦ: Marc. viii 19 κοφίνους πλήρεις (-ρης A F G M) κλασμάτων: 2 Jo. 8 μισθὸν πλήρη (-ρης L) . . . Papyr. Berol. no. xiii 8 ἅπερ ἀπέσχαμεν πλήρης: lxxxi 27 ἃς παραδώσω πλήρης: cclxx 9, ccclxxiii 13, 21.'

With regard to the Septuagint, πλήρης appears from the Concordance to be used—in other cases than the nominative masculine or feminine, as to which, of course, there is no question—in about seventy places; and in nearly half of these some one of the MSS collated for Dr. Swete's edition gives the form πλήρης. So Gen. xxvii 27 D E, xli 24 D; Exod. xvi 33 B; Lev. ii 2 B; Num. vii 13 F, vii 19 ℵ, vii 20 B ℵ*, vii 62 A B, vii 67 B, vii 79 B, vii 86 B F, xxiv 13 A; IV Reg. vi 17 A; Job xxi 24 ℵ A B C, xxxix 2 B; Ps. lxxiv (lxxv) 8 (9) ℵ^{ca}; Sap. v 22 (23) ℵ, xi 18 (19) ℵ; Ecclus. xix 26 (23) ℵ^{ca} B C, xlii 16 ℵ B; Isa. i 15 Γ, xxx 27 ℵ, li 20 B, lxiii 3 A B Q*; Hierem. v 27 ℵ Q; III Macc. vi 31 V*. Some of these may doubtless be explained away as instances of assimilation, or itacism, or what not; in other cases the reading πλήρης is so strongly supported that it is probably right; but anyhow the mass of evidence at least proves this much, that the indeclinable use of πλήρης, whether originally due to the septuagint translators or only to scribes, was not unfamiliar in the earliest centuries of our era.

As to the parallel cases in the New Testament, the passage already cited from Dr. Blass exhausts the evidence of the MSS, but a patristic commentary on Acts vi 5 (where the MSS of the Greek Testament are strongest for πλήρης) merits attention, as it shows the progressive tendency first of the scribes of later date, and secondly of the editors of our own day, to wander from the true tradition. Didymus of Alexandria's comment (in Cramer's Catena, *ad loc.*) ought in fact to be printed thus:

Στέφανος γοῦν μαρτυρεῖται τῆς ἐκλογῆς τετυχηκέναι διὰ τὸ ΠΛΉΡΗϹ εἶναι ΠΊϹΤΕΩϹ καὶ ΠΝΕΎΜΑΤΟϹ· οὐ παντὸς τοῦ ὁπωσδήποτε πιστεύοντος πλήρης ὄντος πίστεως, εἴρηται γὰρ περί τινος ὀφθέντος τῷ Πέτρῳ πίστιν ἔχοντος οὐ μὴν πλήρης αὐτῆς ὄντος.

‘Stephen is recorded to have been selected because he was “full of faith and the spirit,” not every believer of any sort being “full of faith,” for mention is made of one who was seen by Peter to “have faith,” but not to be “full” of it.’ The last words appear to refer to Acts xiv 9, where however it is St. Paul who sees that the lame man at Lystra ἔχει πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι. Worse treatment could not have befallen the latter part of this quotation from Didymus than the MS and the editor between them have managed to inflict. For punctuation they have put a colon after πιστεύοντος, another after ὄντος πίστεως, and a comma after τῷ Πέτρῳ, and it is not possible to say who should bear the blame; but for the reading the original hand of the MS apparently had πλήρης in all three cases, though the η has been erased at the second and third occurrence of the word, while the editor on the third occasion boldly substitutes πλήρους.

Outside the LXX and New Testament the following instances may be noted where the manuscript tradition of πλήρης indeclinable has proved a stumbling-block to editors:—

(i) Gizeh fragment of the Book of Enoch: read with the MS in xxviii 2 (ed. Charles, p. 367) αὐτὸ ἔρημον καὶ αὐτὸ μόνον πλήρης δένδρων, in xxxi 2 (Charles, p. 369) πάντα τὰ δένδρα πλήρης.

(ii) Gospel of Nicodemus or Acts of Pilate, in Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, A.D. 1853, p. 253, A.D. 1876, p. 272: read with the oldest MS (B) καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ Τῇ παρασκευῇ περὶ ὥραν δεκάτην ἐνεκλείσατέ με καὶ ἔμεινα τὸ σάββατον πλήρης.

(iii) Synodal letter from Antioch to the Emperor Jovian, A.D. 364, in Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii 25: διὸ συνετάξαμεν τῇδε ἡμῶν τῇ ἀναφορᾷ καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ . . . ἥτις ἐστίν· Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ μαθήματος πλήρης. In this case the editors have not tampered with the text, but Valesius notes: *Vox autem* πλήρης *nullum hic locum habet; melius meo quidem iudicio poneretur post verba quae paullo supra leguntur* ἥτις ἐστίν.

(iv) Epiphanius, *Haer.* li 16: read βαπτισθέντος αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ Αἰγυπτίους ὡς ἔφημεν Ἀθὺρ δωδεκάτῃ πρὸ ἓξ εἰδῶν Νοεμβρίων τούτεστι πρὸ ἑξήκοντα ἡμερῶν πλήρης τῆς ἡμέρας τῶν Ἐπιφανίων . . . ἦν γὰρ τῷ μὲν ὄντι εἰκοσιεννέα ἐτῶν καὶ μηνῶν δέκα ὅτε ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἧκε, τριάκοντα μὲν ἐτῶν ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πλήρης· διὸ λέγει Ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα. Here the manuscript tradition twice gives πλήρης: in the second instance the editors retain it, doubtless understanding it wrongly as nominative instead of genitive; in the first, where the case intended is beyond doubt—‘sixty full days before the Epiphany’—Petavius brackets the word, Dindorf omits it, and Oehler alters it into πληρῶν.

The mass of evidence now accumulated will have shown that there is nothing improbable in itself in the use of πλήρης indeclinable by St. John. It remains to inquire what positive support antiquity gives to the view that πλήρης is actually so used in John i 14.

That only those well acquainted with Greek could interpret πλήρης in this way is evident enough; there is therefore nothing remarkable in the fact that Latin and Syriac translators for the most part take it as a nominative. It should be noted, however, that the two Old Latin MSS *a* and *e* both read *Verbum . . . plenus gratia et ueritate*, which (if it does not point to an earlier *sermo* for *uerbum*) shows that there was no thought on their part of connecting πλήρης with ὁ λόγος. D has πλήρη, which suggests that the Latin *d*, here unfortunately defective, read *plenam*, and therefore connected it with *gloriam*. The Curetonian Syriac seems to connect πλήρης with λόγος; the Lewis is defective; the Peshitto, on the other hand, appears to connect πλήρης with μονογενοῦς, 'the only-begotten which is from the Father which is full of grace and truth.'

We fall back then on the Greek Fathers, though in fact two of the seven who will be here quoted are extant in full only in translations, Irenaeus in Latin, Theodore in Syriac.

(i) St. Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* V xviii 2, '*Et Verbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis*: et iterum intulit *Et uidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre, plenum gratia et ueritate.*' Here the representation of πλήρης by *plenum* is of course due to the translator. The author obviously separated the clauses καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας from the preceding words, and cannot therefore have taken πλήρης with λόγος. What he did understand by it is clear from another passage, I viii 5: 'Cuius *gloriam uidimus* et erat gloria eius qualis erat unigeniti quae a patre data est ei *plena gratia et ueritate*[1],' or in the original Greek as preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxi 29, οὗ τὴν δόξαν ἐθεασάμεθα, φησί, καὶ ἦν ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ οἵα ἦν ἡ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. The weight of the evidence is not diminished if Irenaeus is here, as is probable, quoting verbally from the Valentinians.

(ii) Origen's Commentary on St. John is not extant in this place; but a passage preserved in Corderius' Catena, *ad loc.* (printed with fresh manuscript authority in Brooke's edition, ii 219), Οὗτος δὲ μονογενὴς παρὰ πατρὸς πάντως πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας εἴρηται, suggests at least that he took πλήρης as genitive in agreement with μονογενοῦς.

---

[1] Massuet reads *plenum* (which makes nonsense) without any manuscript authority, and is somewhat severe upon Grabe, Petavius, and Billius, 'doctissimos alioqui uiros,' for connecting πλήρης with δόξαν. Yet Grabe had pointed out that Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact (see below) do the same as Irenaeus; though, not knowing that πλήρης can be indeclinable, he was bound to add that they had misinterpreted St. John. Massuet's remarks, which are adopted by Stieren (not however by Harvey), are an unpleasant reminder of the truth that later editors and commentators have sometimes been further from the mark than earlier ones.

(iii) St. Athanasius, it would seem, like Irenaeus (Chrysostom) Cyril and Theophylact, understood πλήρης to refer back to δόξαν: *de decretis Nicaenae synodi* 15 (ed. Bened., i 221) ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης εἰρηκὼς Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο· ἐπήγαγεν εὐθὺς Καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας; and *fragm. in Psalm.* lxiv 10 (ed. Bened., ii 1257) Καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

(iv) A Syriac version of Theodore of Mopsuestia on St. John has lately been printed from a Paris MS by M. J.-B. Chabot. The commentary treats the second half of John i 14 (καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα &c.) quite independently of the first, and reads, as represented by the translator, 'And we beheld his glory like of the only-begotten which is from the Father which is full of grace and truth.' This apparent connexion of πλήρης with μονογενοῦς may be borrowed by the translator from the Peshitto, but at least the separation from ὁ λόγος must go back to the original.

(v) St. Chrysostom in his Homilies on St. John makes a separate heading for Hom. XII. [XI.] (ed. Bened. viii 66) with the half-verse καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, and twice (69 D, 70 C) quotes it καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πλήρη χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, so that he must have connected πλήρης with δόξαν.

(vi) St. Cyril of Alexandria in his Commentary on St. John (ed. Pusey, i 142) heads a section with the same words as St. Chrysostom; and that he too took πλήρης with δόξαν results from the phrase πλήρης[1] χάριτος ἔχειν τὴν δόξαν ἔφη τὸν υἱὸν ὁ πνευματόφορος, 'the inspired writer said that the Son has his glory "full of grace"' (Pusey, i 143 fin.).

(vii) Theophylact in his Commentary on the Four Gospels writes *ad loc.*: Οὕτως οὖν κἀνταῦθα τὸ Ὡς μονογενοῦς ὀφείλομεν νοῆσαι ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἡ δόξα ἣν ἐθεασάμεθα ὡς τῷ ὄντι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν υἱοῦ δόξα ἦν πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας· χάριτος μὲν πλήρης, καθὸ καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ κεχαριτωμένος ἦν ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, καθὰ καί . . . ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ὅτι Ἐθαύμαζον πάντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος . . .· ἀληθείας δὲ πλήρης ἦν, καθὸ καὶ . . . ὁ χριστὸς ἃ ἔλεγε καὶ ἔπραττεν ἅπαντα ἀληθείας πλήρη, αὐτόχαρις ὢν καὶ αὐτοαλήθεια . . . ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγεν ἔβλεπον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. 'So then here too we ought to understand the phrase "As of an only-begotten" as equivalent to the phrase, "The glory which we beheld as in very truth was glory of a son, full of grace and truth": glory full of grace just as his speech was with grace, as the evangelist says, "They wondered at the words of grace"; and glory full of truth, just as everything that the Christ said or did was full of truth, since he was Very Grace and Truth itself: in all that he said or did they "saw his glory."'

---

[1] So Aubert, probably rightly: of Pusey's two MSS, E has πληρεις, B (and Pusey) πλήρη. In the next line for ποῖ ποτε προκόψει τὸ πλῆρες; πλήρης should be read with Pusey's B. But whichever form Cyril used himself, it is clear that he supposed St. John to be connecting πλήρης with δόξαν.

It cannot be doubted on this catena that Greek antiquity did not connect πλήρης with ὁ λόγος; it can hardly be doubted that it did connect it with δόξαν.

2. ON GELASIUS OF CYZICUS.

THE *History of the Nicene Council* by the fifth-century writer, Gelasius of Cyzicus, is printed in the larger conciliar collections: Labbe-Coleti ii 117–296, Mansi ii 759–946. Among the authorities of whom he claims to have made use is 'Rufinus, a presbyter of Rome, who, like Eusebius, took part in that holy synod' of Nicaea. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (ii 622 *a*) doubts whether the well-known Rufinus of Aquileia is really concealed under this description; the *Real-Encyclopädie* (vi 477) on the other hand considers that no other Rufinus can be meant; but in neither case does it appear to have been noticed that considerable portions of Gelasius are simply an amplified translation into Greek of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*. Indeed, the whole of the narrative of Rufinus that deals with the Council—*Hist. Eccl.* x 1–5—is incorporated directly into Gelasius' second book: Rufinus x 1 = Gelasius ii 2, Ruf. x 2 = Gel. ii 8, Ruf. x 3 = Gel. ii 13, Ruf. x 4 = Gel. ii 9, Ruf. x 5 = Gel. ii 10, 11 (first part), 24 (last part), 26 (near to end). The source of Gel. ii 10, 11 is wrongly ascribed in the margin of the editions to Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i 12; as a matter of fact, both Socrates and Gelasius (as a moment's comparison suffices to show) derived their account of Bishop Spyridon of Cyprus from Rufinus.

It is also worth noticing that in the words immediately preceding the last adaptation from Rufinus in Gelasius ii. 26 (Labbe-Coleti ii 234, Mansi ii 880), we have a fragment of the original Greek of a note appended to the Nicene Creed in some of the old Latin collections of canons, and in Armenian and Coptic[1], but not, so far as I know, preserved elsewhere in Greek: Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις ἣν ἐξέθεντο οἱ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἅγιοι ἡμῶν πατέρες οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι ἐπίσκοποι, πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ Ἀρείου βλασφημοῦντος καὶ λέγοντος κτίσμα τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κατὰ Σαβελλίου τε καὶ Φωτεινοῦ καὶ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως καὶ Μανιχαίου καὶ Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ κατὰ πάσης δὲ αἱρέσεως ἥτις ἐπανέστη τῇ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οὓς [*lege* ἃς?] κατέ-

---

[1] Coptic in Pitra's *Spicilegium Solesmense*, i 514; Armenian in Gelzer, Hilgenfeld and Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina . . . armeniace*, p. 184.

κρινεν ἡ ἐν τῆ Νικαέων πόλει συνηγμένη τῶν ἁγίων ὀρθοδόξων σύνοδος, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὑποτεταγμένα. The mention of Photinus shows that the origin of the note must be decidedly posterior to the date of the Nicene Council.

3. ON EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLI.

THE following notes on Eusebius of Vercelli make no claim to express in any sense settled opinions; they are only intended to serve, if it may be, as starting-points for those more familiar than myself with the Latin dogmatic literature of the fourth and fifth centuries. But at least this much may be said confidently, that Eusebius must have been a more important personage than we are accustomed to think.

1. The authorship and date of the Creed *Quicumque vult* have always been matter of dispute, but the amount of labour which has been devoted to their elucidation during the last five and twenty years ought to be bringing us near to a final solution of the problem. A generation ago it was possible—though no doubt even then only under the influence of strong prejudices—to defend a date as late as the eighth century. Such a view seems quite antiquated now, when scholars have learnt to discuss the historical questions of date and authorship of the Creed without reference to its suitability or unsuitability for public recitation. Even the ascription to Hilary of Arles (*c.* 440 A. D.) in Waterland's classical treatise brings it down too late in the view of the best recent investigators. Mr. Ommanney selects a slightly earlier date with the authorship of Vincent of Lerins; Mr. Burn sees no trace of reference to Nestorianism, and pushes the formula back to the decade 420–430 A.D., and to the authorship of Honoratus of Arles; Dr. Kattenbusch sees similarly no trace of the influence of St. Augustine, and moves back a decade further still, *c.* 415 A.D. The two last-named scholars appear to agree in limiting the heresies principally combated to Sabellianism, Arianism, Macedonianism, and Apollinarianism. Pending a completely satisfactory theory—a hint thrown out in the *Revue Bénédictine* suggests that we may look for something final from Dom Morin and his coadjutors—it may not be amiss to call attention to the statement, precise in one sense if confused in another, of an anonymous mediaeval writer.

In the Irish *Liber Hymnorum* lately published by the Henry Bradshaw Society occurs a statement (ii p. 92) attached to the *Quicumque* to the effect that 'The synod of Nicaea made this Catholic faith: three bishops of them alone made it, viz. Eusebius and Dionysius *et nomen tertii nescimus*,' &c. I cannot doubt that the two bishops named are meant for Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan, both of whom were exiled by Constantius about A.D. 355–356 for refusing to condemn Athanasius. Of the fate of the latter nothing seems known; the former assisted in the great Alexandrine synod of A.D. 362, was restored soon afterwards to his see, and is said to have died about A.D. 375. As is well known, the Codex Vercellensis (*a*) of the Old Latin Gospels is traditionally attributed to his hand. In the parallel case of the *Te Deum* the notice of the same *Liber Hymnorum* runs (ii p. 22), 'Niceta, successor of Peter, made this canticle, and in Rome it was made,' &c. The true author of the *Te Deum* was probably Bishop Niceta of Remesiana in Dacia, *c.* A.D. 400, and the confusion of his see with Rome—*Remesianae ciuitatis*, *Romanae ciuitatis*—occurs also elsewhere.

Now if the Irish Book has in this involved way preserved traces of a true record of the authorship of the *Te Deum,* may not the case be exactly parallel for the *Quicumque*? The connexion with Nicaea must be wrong: but may not the name of Eusebius be right?

To make the Eusebian authorship possible, it would be necessary to prove first that Dr. Kattenbusch is right as against Mr. Burn in making the Creed earlier than St. Augustine. I am wholly without such special knowledge as would entitle me to intervene in this discussion, but I may note that Mr. Burn himself writes (*Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 146) that he has 'often wondered whether the following sentence referred to a formal profession'; 'Sed in ea nonnulli perturbantur cum audiunt Deum Patrem et Deum Filium et Deum Spiritum sanctum, et tamen hanc Trinitatem non tres Deos sed unum Deum' (*De Trinitate* I v 8).

It would be necessary next to show as against both Mr. Burn and Dr. Kattenbusch that there is nothing to prevent our pushing back the Creed as much as a generation before St. Augustine. As regards the subject-matter of the Creed, the heresies against which these two scholars agree that it was directed were all condemned by that Alexandrine synod of A. D. 362 at which Eusebius, as we have seen, was present. There, if not before, he must have mastered the theology of Athanasius, to reproduce it perhaps later on for the West in the form of the Athanasian Creed: at least it is worth noting that in describing the confession of this synod, Rufinus falls almost into the very language of the *Quicumque*: 'ut eiusdem substantiae ac deitatis, cuius Pater et Filius, etiam Spiritus sanctus crederetur, nec quicquam prorsus in Trinitate aut creatum aut inferius posteriusue diceretur' (*H. E.* x 29).

One difficulty, such as it is, would find an easy solution if the conjecture here thrown out as to the authorship of the Creed is correct. The attribution to St. Athanasius of a statement of the Faith composed on the basis of his teaching by his friend and contemporary Eusebius of Vercelli would be the most natural thing in the world.

2. When working at the MSS of canons in the Vatican Library this spring, I had occasion to examine Vaticanus 1319, a MS of the twelfth century. It contains at the end some portions (Books I II VI VII) of the writing *de Trinitate* printed under the name of the late fifth-century writer, Vigilius of Thapsus, and between Books II and III (VI of 'Vigilius') occurs the name 'Sancti Eusebii.' I now find that the same phenomenon had attracted Dom Morin's attention, and that he has discussed the question in the *Revue Bénédictine* for January 1898, giving the additional information that Eusebius is also named as author in the list that heads the volume. He is decidedly of opinion that the *terminus a quo* for Books I–VII of 'Vigilius' *de Trinitate* need not be brought down later than the Council of Rimini in A.D. 359, and appears to think not unfavourably of the chances that Eusebius of Vercelli may be the real author.

Yet another topic therefore demanding consideration is this work of pseudo-Vigilius on the Trinity, both in relation to other documents and also in relation to the *Quicumque* itself. It is in the hope that some one may throw light on all these questions that I have ventured to print this note.

C. H. TURNER.

REVIEWS

THE VULGATE GOSPELS AND THE *CODEX BRIXIANUS.*

THE Oxford critical edition of the Vulgate is one of those fortunate publications which from the very first take a position of recognized authority. It is superfluous to praise the Bishop of Salisbury or Mr. H. J. White for industry and learning, but the appearance of the *Epilogus*, which marks the completion of the volume of the Gospels in their edition, affords a convenient opportunity for taking account of the light thrown by their investigations on the character of St. Jerome's work and its subsequent fate in transmission.

Previous *fasciculi* have contained the text of the four Gospels with the various readings of some thirty selected manuscripts, but the Editors' *Prolegomena* prefixed to St. Matthew had contained no discussion of St. Jerome's methods or any detailed examination of the MS evidence. These wants are supplied in the *Epilogus*, which forms by far the most thorough investigation hitherto published about the textual character of the Vulgate and its relations both to the Greek and to the various forms of the Old Latin. The value of the book is still further increased by useful indices of Proper Names and of Latin words with their Greek equivalents, together with other matter of a more miscellaneous description. In this forest of valuable information I hope I shall not appear captious, if I confine myself to one important point in which it seems to me that the position taken by the Oxford editors is somewhat insecure.

St. Jerome's text of the Gospels was a Revision, not a new Translation. As he himself says: *Quae* (i. e. *eŭangelia*) *ne multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperauimus ut his tantum quae sensum uidebantur mutare correctis reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant.* It becomes therefore highly important to identify as far as possible the text which he used as the basis of his work. If we can find this text, then the differences between it and the Vulgate represent the changes due to St. Jerome.

The Oxford editors consider that the basis of the Vulgate was the text called *Italian* by Dr. Hort. That great scholar, who was the first to make any intelligible classification of our Old Latin MSS, divided them into three sets, 'African,' 'European,' and 'Italian.' The 'Italian' type of text, according to Dr. Hort, was 'evidently due to various revisions of the European text,' made 'partly to bring it into accord with such Greek MSS as chanced to be available, partly to give the Latinity a smoother and more customary aspect.' Out of the 14 Old Latin MSS of which any considerable remains survive two were assigned to the 'African' family, ten to the 'European,' and only two (*f* and *q*) to the 'Italian.' Judging from these numbers the 'European' texts must have been much more widely spread than the 'Italian,' although we might have reasonably expected that the text which St. Jerome used as the basis of his work would have had the larger number of surviving representatives to-day.

Mr. White himself edited *q* in 1888, and shewed in his Introduction that its composition is totally different from that of *f*. Both Dr. Hort's 'Italian' MSS—Cod. Brixianus (*f*) and Cod. Monacensis (*q*)—break away from other O. Latin texts in having many 'Antiochian' readings, i.e. they agree with the Received Text rather than with Codex Bezae; but in their Latinity they differ, and can hardly be reckoned as belonging to the same recension. Speaking roughly, *q* keeps with the main body of the 'European' MSS, while *f* either agrees with the Vulgate or goes its own way.

Thus the 'Italian type of text' has been reduced to a single MS Nevertheless, Bishop Wordsworth and Mr. White seem to have had no misgivings in setting down *f* as a typical representative of the MSS upon which St. Jerome based his revision, nor (so far as I am aware) has their judgement in this matter hitherto been called in question. They print *f* in full below their text of the Vulgate, but they give no formal proof that the type of text represented by *f* is anterior to St. Jerome. I confess to being a little disappointed not to find the relations between *f* and the Vulgate treated more fully: in view of the honourable post which *f* has been called upon to fill, it needs a careful and separate study. The Oxford editors only say (p. 656): 'Obseruandum est nos in codice Brixiano (*f*) adminiculum firmissimum huic difficillimo operi possidere. Constat enim ex collatione perpetua quam necessario fecimus, et quam candidus lector pro se facere non negliget, hanc textus Latini formam uel aliam simillimam Hieronymo pro fundamento recensionis suae fuisse. Quam formam critici hodierni Italam uocant.' There is no doubt whatever as to the marked agreement of *f* with the Vulgate. I suppose the two are identical for nearly 90 per cent. of the text, so that some demonstration is needed that *f* itself is independent of the Vulgate. In view of this it occurred to me, when asked to review the Oxford Vulgate for the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, that an independent study of *f* might bring out something of interest.

I can only say that I am surprised at the end of my investigation. The one clear result is the intimate connexion which exists between *f* and the Gothic version of the N. T. It is unlikely that we should possess MSS of a Latin recension which first served as the foundation of the Vulgate and then affected the Gothic version, and I am beginning to wonder whether the facts have not been reversed. May not *f* be derived from an O. Latin MS which had been partly corrected to the Vulgate, before it was altered to suit the readings and renderings of the Gothic?

Codex Brixianus, known to textual critics since Lachmann as *f*, is a MS of the four Gospels (Mt. Ioh. Lc. Mc.) written in silver letters on purple vellum. It is ascribed to the sixth century, and was edited by Bianchini in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex* together with Codd. Vercellensis (*a*) and Veronensis (*b*). It is still preserved in the library at Brescia, one of the great seats of Lombardo-Gothic influence. Before the Gospels and after the Eusebian Canons comes a curious preface, one sentence of which bears on our study[1]: *ideo ne in interpraetationibus linguarum secundum quae in interiora libri ostenduntur legenti uideatur aliud in graeca lingua*[2], *aliud in latina uel gotica, designata esse conscribta, illud aduertat quis quod si pro disciplina lingua discrepationem ostendit, ad unam tamen intentionem concurrit.* The preface goes on to promise a system of *adnotationes*, marked according as they give the Greek or the Latin reading, but nothing of this sort has been found in *f*. It has hitherto been supposed that the preface belongs to a lost Gothic codex, but it would equally well serve as the introduction to a bilingual Latino-Gothic codex which was provided with some critical notes. Our Codex Brixianus might be a copy of this bilingual, *with the Gothic left out*. However this may be, the preface gives us cause to look for Gothic influence in *f*.

As a matter of fact *f* and the Gothic (i. e. the Cod. Argenteus now at Upsala) often agree, but not every agreement is of significance. The Gothic version was made by Ulphilas in the middle of the fourth century from Greek MSS of the ordinary 'Antiochian' type, and cod. *f* is acknowledged to follow the same type of Greek MSS: mere agreements, therefore, of *f* and Goth. with the Textus Receptus might be explained as the result of independent revision from the Greek. Again, the Gothic version is under suspicion of having been revised or influenced by the Latin. Readings, therefore, where *f* and Goth. agree with the O. Latin or the Vulgate do not necessarily prove any close connexion between *f* and Goth. We must confine ourselves to the peculiar readings of *f*, where it differs both from the Vulgate and the O. Latin.

---

[1] The text is given most correctly in Haupt, *Opuscula* ii 409. I see no reason for doubting the statement made lower down in this preface, that the Gothic word 'uulthres' is used for a critical note ['latina uero lingua *adnotatio* significatur']. The derivation might be from διάφορον, just as we speak of a 'variant.'

[2] *Linguae* Cod.

With such a restricted field to choose from I shall give the instances which appear to me significant in the order of their cogency, not in that of the Gospels[1].

1. Lc. xiv 32 εἰ δὲ μήγε. The Latin renderings of this phrase here are 'ceterum' (*e*), 'si quo minus' (*d*), 'alioquin' (*a b ff l q r* vg), but

'si autem impossibilis est' *f*.

eithau jabai nist mahteigs Goth. (= 'or if he is not able').

Similarly in Mc. ii 21, 22, where other Latin MSS have 'alioquin' or 'sin autem,' *f* alone has 'ne' in agreement with Goth. *ïbai.*

2. Lc. vi 7 κατηγορίαν.

'occasionem accusandi illum' *f*.

til du vrohjan ïna Goth. (= 'an opportunity to accuse him').

The other Latin authorities support the alternative Greek reading κατηγορεῖν and vary between 'accusare,' 'unde accusarent,' &c. Here there can be no doubt of the close connexion between *f* and Goth. Does it not also appear that *f* is rather a translation of the paraphrase in the Gothic than *vice versa*?

3. Matt. vi 24 ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται.

The true O. Latin texts appear to have read ἀνέξεται: the renderings are 'unum sustinebit' (vg), 'alterum sustinebit' (*k*), 'unum patietur' (*a b c g h q*). But 'uno obediet' *f*, with the Gothic (*ainamma ufhauseith*).

4. Matt. ix 8 ἐφοβήθησαν ℵBD, &c., lat. vt-vg (exc. *f*).

ἐθαύμασαν Gr. rell.

'admirantes timuerunt' *f*.

ohtedun sildaleikjandans Goth. (= 'timuerunt admirantes').

No other Latin MS but *f* in any way recognizes the reading ἐθαύμασαν.

5. Matt. xxvii 42 'et credimus' Latt. (= Gr.).

'ut uideamus et credamus' *f* (= Goth.).

This example forms a parallel to No. 4.

6. Matt. xxvii 3 κατεκρίθη.

'damnatus' lat. vt-vg ('iudicatus' *h*).

'ad iudicium ductus' *f*.

du stauai gatauhans Goth. (= 'to judgement brought').

7. Matt. xxvii 49 σώσων.

---

[1] It is worth remarking that the order of the Gospels both in *f* and Goth. is Mt. Joh. Lc. Mc.

'liberans' lat.vg, 'et liberauit' lat.vt^{pler}, 'et saluabit' *h*, but σῶσαι ℵ* 69.
'saluare' *f.* (*cf.* 'liberare' DEꝐ^{mg} *ap. Wordsw.*)
nasjan Goth. (= 'to save').

8. Mc. iv 24 ὑμῖν (at end of verse) lat. vt-vg (= ℵBCDLΔ al).
+ 'qui auditis' *q* (= Gr. rel).
+ 'credentibus' *f* (= Goth.).

Another line of argument might be formed by tabulating the renderings of Greek words throughout the Gospels. For example, the hypothesis of Gothic influence will explain why *f* has *magnificare* in Matt. ix 8 and Lc. ii 20 for the Vulgate *glorificare.* Or again, in Lc. iv 35, 39, 41, where ἐπιτιμᾶν occurs three times in seven verses, the Vulgate has *increpauit* . . . *imperauit* . . . *imperans* (following *b*); but *f* has *comminatus est* . . . *increpauit* . . . *increpans*, following the Gothic *gawotida* . . . *gasok* . . . *gasakands.*

The occasional close agreement between *f* and the Gothic has been noticed before now by editors of the Gothic version [1], but the explanation usually suggested is that the Gothic has suffered revision from a codex resembling *f.* That the Gothic version has suffered corruption and interpolation from Latin sources is undoubted: all surviving Gothic MSS seem to be relics of the Lombardo-Gothic kingdom [2]. There is an interesting and well-chosen list of passages illustrating the O. Latin elements of our Gothic text in *Migne* xviii 471 f [3]. But the only Latin MS which leaves the Latin ranks and sides singly with the Gothic is *f*: is it not therefore reasonable to regard *f* as having borrowed from the Gothic and not the Gothic from *f*? Moreover, the readings where *f* and Goth. agree are usually those that support the ordinary Greek text: the hypothesis of Gothic influence will explain why *f*, above all known Latin texts, is full of 'Antiochian' readings.

It must be remembered that 'the Gothic version' means the readings of a single codex containing about two-thirds of the Gospels. There is nothing to prove that *f* and the Cod. Argenteus now at Upsala were ever side by side, though they seem to have been contemporaries and to have been written in the same region. If more Gothic MSS had been preserved we may not unreasonably conjecture that more Gothic support would have been forthcoming for readings of *f* which differ from the Vulgate. For example, in Mc. iii 29 *f* supports 'eternal judgement' while Goth supports 'eternal sin,' and in Matt. ix 15 *f* has the well-supported O. Latin reading *ieiunare* for *lugere*. In each of these cases the Cod. Argenteus agrees with the Vulgate.

---

[1] See e. g. *Migne* xviii 474.

[2] It would be interesting to hunt for relics of Gothic influence in the early *Vulgate* MSS of North Italy. Thus the spelling *aggelus* in the Milan MS M is characteristically Gothic, but I have not come upon any trace of Gothic influence in J, although Friuli, like Brescia, was a great centre of the Lombards.

[3] They may be arranged for our present purpose thus: (i) agreement with several O. Latin texts, including *f*, Matt. x 29, Mc. vii 3, xiv 65, Lc. ii 14, ix 2, 20, 43, xix 22; (ii) agreement with O. Latin texts, where *f* follows the Vulgate, Lc. i 3, 29, ix 50, xvi 31; (iii) agreement with *f* alone, Lc. v 3, 10, Joh. vii 9.

The presence of an element in *f* derived from the Gothic version is very far from clearing up all the difficulties connected with the text of that MS[1]. All I claim here is, that the demonstration of a strain of text in *f* closely akin to the Gothic 'constitutes a *fait nouveau*' which demands a new trial of its relation to the Vulgate[2].

It may be interesting to non-specialists to consider how far our ideas of the composition of the Vulgate would be affected by this view of Cod. Brixianus. According to the theory adopted by the Oxford Editors the Vulgate was a not very thorough revision of a MS like *f*, i. e. an O. Latin MS which had somehow been already assimilated to the ordinary Greek text. On this hypothesis the textual changes introduced by St. Jerome were mostly in the direction of agreement with ℵ and B; like the English Revisers, he started with the 'Received Text' and altered it more or less to agree with 'Westcott and Hort.' But if Cod. Brixianus (*f*) be not a true O. Latin MS at all, but a mixture of the Vulgate with readings derived from the Gothic (together with a very small percentage of genuine O. Latin variants), then St. Jerome's work was a true *Nouum Opus*. The Vulgate would then have been based upon some text more like cod. Veronensis (*b*), and the textual changes would have been 'Antiochian' as well as Alexandrian in the wider sense. Is not this intrinsically more probable? Is it not something of an anachronism to think of St. Jerome at the end of the fourth century cutting out *Antiochian*, as well as *Western*, readings in favour of the old-fashioned texts of ℵ and B?

It would extend this review to undue length if I were to go on to discuss the evidence afforded by St. Jerome's own Commentaries as to the Greek texts approved by him, and indeed it would take us away from the main question. The one thing which I wish to lay before my readers is whether the connexion of *f* with the Gothic Version is not too close to allow us to regard it as a type of text which could have existed in Latin during the fourth century.

F. C. BURKITT.

---

[1] Neither a Vulgate origin nor revision from the Gothic explains the rendering of πραεῖς by *mansueti* in Matt. v 5. The distribution of evidence is curious: *f g h q* have *mansueti*, but *mites* is in *a b c d k* as well as vg.

[2] A similar type of text to that of *f* is to be found in the palimpsest fragments of the Pauline Epp. usually cited as *gue*. They clearly follow the Gothic against other Latin evidence, so that it is quite improper to include *gue* among O. Latin 'authorities.'

THE WISDOM OF BEN-SIRA.

Portions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection, presented to the University of Cambridge by the Editors. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by S. Schechter, M.A., Litt.D., and C. Taylor, D.D. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1899.)

This work, the publication of which has been so eagerly awaited during the last twelve months, contains the second great instalment of the Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus. It will be remembered that the Oxford edition (1897) comprised ten leaves, all belonging to the same codex, and extending from chap. xxxix 15 to chap. xlix 11. The present edition includes seven more leaves of the aforesaid codex (which the editors call B), and four leaves of a codex previously unknown (which they call A). With the exception of one leaf of B, which Dr. Schechter published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Jan., 1898), all this matter is new. It should be mentioned that the MSS A and B differ greatly in aspect; the text of the former is written closely and continuously, while the latter is in a larger hand and the lines are divided into hemistichs. Accordingly a page of A contains nearly twice as much matter as a page of B.

The passages included in this volume are the following :—

MS A	chaps.	iii 6–vii 29.
	„	xi 34–xvi 26.
MS B	„	xxx 11–xxxi 11.
	„	xxxii 1–xxxiii 3.
	„	xxxv 9–xxxvi 21.
	„	xxxvii 27–xxxviii 27.
	„	xlix 12–li 30.

It was lately announced in the *Times* (April 4, 1899) that two more leaves of B have been acquired by the British Museum. From a statement in Dr. Taylor's Preface (p. vi) it would appear that these contain chaps. xxxi 12–xxxii 1 and chaps. xxxvi 22–xxxvii 26 respectively. Thus if we include all the fragments discovered hitherto, and ignore the small lacunae due to the tattered condition of certain pages, we find that the extant Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus consists of the following five portions :—

MS A	chaps.	iii 6–vii 29.
	„	xi 34–xvi 26.
MS B	„	xxx 11–xxxiii 3.
	„	xxxv 9–xxxviii 27.
	„	xxxix 15–li 30;

that is to say, we possess twenty-three complete chapters and parts of nine other chapters, which amounts to rather more than half of the entire book. It is of course possible that more fragments may soon be brought to light, and the probability of such an occurrence is greatly increased by the discovery of MS A.

Neither A nor B can be dated with certainty, but from the fact that both are written on paper it would seem that they are not earlier than the ninth century of our era[1]. Probably neither is later than the twelfth century. As to the districts in which they were copied we have no definite information. The glosses in Persian which are found on the margin of B are sometimes so difficult to interpret that one cannot but suspect that the scribe was ignorant of the Persian language, in other words, that these glosses were not composed by him but copied incorrectly from an older MS written in a Persian-speaking district. It is interesting to note that two of the glosses in question contain the word אידר 'here'[2] which was commonly used by Persian writers of the tenth and eleventh centuries (such as Firdausī), but became obsolete soon afterwards, *darīnjā* or *īnjā* being substituted for it.

Any attempt to determine the precise relation which exists between the Hebrew text and the versions would at present be premature. By arbitrarily selecting particular variants and building theories upon them, one may, of course, prove anything that one wishes; but it is obvious that until *all* the variants have been carefully examined and classified no final conclusion can be reached[3]. One important fact, however, seems to be clearly established by the publication before us. It is well known that the Greek and the Syriac texts of Ecclesiasticus differ widely, and critics have long ago recognized that the Syriac version, as well as the Greek, was made direct from the Hebrew. When the Oxford fragments were published, it was remarked at once that the Hebrew text often sided with the Greek against the Syriac, often with the Syriac against the Greek, and often differed from both alike[4]. But it now appears that this is not true of the Hebrew text in general; it is true of MS B only. MS A often diverges both from the Greek and the Syriac, and often sides with the Syriac against the Greek, *but it very seldom sides with the Greek against the Syriac* (see the Introduction,

---

[1] The oldest Arabic MS on paper is of the year 866. See E. M. Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* (1893), p. 43.

[2] See the Oxford edition, p. 24 margin (where the editors wrongly read אורד), and the Cambridge edition, Text, p. 15 margin; cf. also the Notes, p. 59.

[3] The Syriac version requires much more minute attention than it has yet received, for Lagarde's edition (*Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace*, 1861) is based upon only one really old MS.

[4] The most notable case in which the Hebrew text differs from both versions is found in chap. li, where the Hebrew has fifteen additional verses.

p. 11). Hence it is probable that A and B represent different types of text, *both* of which were current among the Jews at some time in the Middle Ages. Which of the two types is the more primitive, and whether either of them has been in any way influenced by one or both of the versions, we cannot as yet decide. Unfortunately these investigations are greatly complicated by the numerous corruptions in the Hebrew text; in spite of all the learning and industry which Dr. Taylor has expended upon his translation, it must be admitted that many passages still remain unintelligible, and even those passages which present no linguistic difficulty sometimes contain so many repetitions and other suspicious phenomena that it is impossible to regard them as accurate transcripts of the original text. Evidently both A and B are the result of a long and complicated textual history. That manuscripts of such a work as Ecclesiasticus should abound in 'doublets' is only what one might expect, for the nature of the contents favoured interpolations and transpositions of every sort. Similar doublets are often found in copies of the Arabic and Persian poets; as in the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, they are sometimes written on the margin, sometimes between the lines, and sometimes are outwardly indistinguishable from the text itself.

Considering the many traces of textual corruption which these MSS exhibit, it is remarkable that the general character of the language appears to be much the same throughout; in this respect there is no essential difference between A and B, although, as we have seen, they probably belong to distinct families of MSS. Hence we may reasonably infer that, in spite of numerous changes in particular passages, the language and style of the original author have, on the whole, been preserved. The Hebrew of Ben-Sira exactly corresponds to what the results of modern Biblical criticism would have led us to expect. In vocabulary, in grammar, and in syntax it resembles the later portions of the Old Testament, and differs considerably from the Mishnah. It is true that here and there Ben-Sira makes use of Mishnic words or phrases, but the same thing is notoriously the case with several Biblical books, such as Daniel, Esther, and Koheleth[1]. The great difference, however, between Ben-Sira and the Mishnah may be illustrated by a single fact. In the Mishnah many Greek words are used, and a few Greek words appear even in the Aramaic of Daniel. In the published fragments of Ben-Sira *not a single Greek word occurs.* On the whole it may be said that the style of Ben-Sira is somewhat more classical than that of Koheleth and the Hebrew parts of Daniel, but this is not necessarily due to difference of date. The authors of Koheleth and Daniel were eminently original thinkers, whereas the mind of Ben-Sira was altogether commonplace, and we should therefore expect him to deal more largely in traditional phraseology. When we examine the words which occur for the first time in Ben-Sira, we find that the great majority appear to have been borrowed from the Aramaic language, which at that time (i. e. about 200 B.C.), was probably spoken in almost every part of Palestine. Unfortunately our information as to the Aramaic of Palestine is very defective, and accordingly it sometimes happens that Aramaic words used by Ben-Sira are known to us from Syriac writings, but not from any Jewish Aramaic source. A notable instance is the verb התעכר (Syr. ܐܬܥܟܪ) 'to tarry,' which, as the editors point out, occurs in chaps. v 7^{a}, vii 10, 16, although the MS in all three cases has ב instead of כ. There is, of course, no reason to doubt that the word really existed in Palestinian Aramaic at the time of Ben-Sira; whether it afterwards became obsolete among the Jews, or whether its non-occurrence in Jewish Aramaic writings is purely accidental, we cannot decide. In comparing the language of Ben-Sira with that of the Mishnah and other post-Biblical books, in Hebrew or in Aramaic, we have to bear in mind that during the four centuries which elapsed between the time of Ben-Sira and the compilation of the Mishnah a series of political and social convulsions, among the most terrible on record, took place in Palestine. The old Jewish aristocracy, which controlled the affairs of the nation during the Persian and the Ptolemaic period, was swept away, the greater part of the Jewish population was exterminated, and finally Jerusalem itself became a heathen colony. All this could not fail to exercise a profound influence on the language and the national traditions; if Ben-Sira did not speak Hebrew, he must at least have possessed much linguistic and literary information which was utterly lost 400 years later.

---

[1] An interesting Mishnic phrase, which Daniel and Ben-Sira have in common, is תמיד in the sense of 'the daily burnt offering' (Dan. viii 11, 13, xi 31, xii 11; Ben-Sira xlv 14). The Oxford editors seem to me to have been here misled by the Greek version.

The precise extent to which Ben-Sira borrowed from the writings now included in the Old Testament is a very difficult question. It has long been recognized that the later writers in the Old Testament borrow largely and deliberately from the works of their predecessors[1]. The use which Ben-Sira makes of the older Jewish literature is often of an exactly similar kind. In his Introduction (pp. 13–25), Dr. Schechter gives us a very useful list of passages which resemble, more or less closely, certain passages in the Canonical books. If, however, we examine the list critically, we find that only a small proportion of these passages can be regarded as real quotations; in the vast majority of

[1] The ninth chapter of Daniel is a particularly instructive example of this, beginning, as it does, with an explicit reference to the writings of Jeremiah.

cases the resemblance is such as often exists between authors writing independently of one another. Many expressions, for example, appear both in Ben-Sira and in the Psalms. But to suppose that all these are borrowed from the Psalms would be very rash, as a single fact will show. When Mesha, king of Moab, in his celebrated inscription, says of his god Chemosh, הראני בכל שנאי 'He caused me to see my desire upon all them that hated me,' he is using almost the exact words of the Psalter (cf. Ps. lix 11 אֱלֹהִים יְרַאֵנִי בְשֹׁרְרָי and Ps. cxviii 7 וַאֲנִי אֶרְאֶה בְשֹׂנְאָי). Yet no one can imagine that king Mesha was a student of the Psalms; the resemblance, striking as it appears, is simply due to the use of a current phrase which the Israelites and the Moabites had in common. Even where the resemblance is too close to admit of such an explanation, it is quite arbitrary to assume that the borrowing must *always* be on the part of Ben-Sira, and *never* on the part of the Psalmists.

Notes on a few passages.

iii 23. וביותר ממך אל תמר is rendered by Dr. Taylor 'And intrude not into that which is beyond thee.' The chief difficulty consists in explaining the verb תמר (Gr. *μὴ περιεργάζου*, Syr. ܠܐ ܬܬܥܩܒ). Dr. Taylor connects it with תמר in Exod. xxiii 21 (where we should, of course, pronounce תֶּמֶר, Hiphil of מרה, not תַּמֵּר), so that the meaning would be 'rebel not (by intruding) into.' But elsewhere המרה ב signifies 'to rebel against,' not 'to rebel into.' If the text be sound, we should probably read תְּמַר, shortened from תְּמָרֶה, Piel of מרה (cf. תְּעַר Ps. cxli 8), in the sense of the Syriac verb ܡܰܪܺܝ 'emulate,' 'imitate,' which is regularly construed with ܒ. The connexion between this meaning and the meaning 'rebel' is shown by the Arabic *mārā* (3rd conj.) 'strive,' 'contend.'

v 9. אל תהיה זורה לכל רוח ופונה דרך שבולת.

'Be not winnowing with every wind,
And turning the way of the stream.'

Instead of דרך שבולת the Gr. has *ἐν πάσῃ ἀτραπῷ*, the Syr. ܒܟܠ ܫܒܝܠ; hence, as is mentioned in the Notes (p. 43), both translators must have read שביל instead of שבולת. But it should also have been mentioned that they both read לכל instead of דרך. Probably the original text had לכל שביל, and the word דרך was afterwards added (perhaps above the line) either as a gloss on שביל or as an alternate reading. A later scribe carelessly substituted דרך for לכל, and שביל became corrupted to שבולת.

vi 1^b שם רע וקלון תוריש חרפה. If תוריש be right, it can only mean 'shall cause to inherit,' not 'shall inherit.' Even when the object of the verb is a city or country (e.g. Josh. viii 7, xvii 12, Judg. i 19), the Hiphil הוריש does not mean 'to inherit' but 'to expel the previous occupants.'

vi 5. חיך ערב ירבה אוהב ושפתי חן שואלו שלום. Here שואלו seems to be a mistake for שׁוֹאֲלֵי, so that the parallelism is complete :—

> ‘A pleasant mouth makes many a friend,
> And gracious lips (make many) saluters.’

The Greek and the Syriac simply substitute the abstract for the concrete.

vi 16. צרור חיים אוהב אמונה. ‘A faithful friend is a bundle of life.’ For צרור the Gr. has *φάρμακον*, the Syr. ܣܡܐ, but it is quite unnecessary to assume that either read צרי ‘balm.’ The Septuagint always renders צרי by *ῥητίνη*, never by *φάρμακον*. The phrase ‘a bundle of life’ appears to have meant originally a charm or amulet to preserve life. This explains the metaphor in 1 Sam. xxv 29, and it is to be noticed that *δεσμός*, by which the Septuagint there translates צרור, is also used for ‘charm,’ e.g. by Ignatius, Epistle to the Ephesians, § xix *ὅθεν ἐλύετο πᾶσα μαγεία καὶ πᾶς δεσμός*. That *φάρμακον* may likewise signify ‘charm’ is well known.

vii 15. אל תאיץ בצבא מלאכת עבדה. Since תאיץ cannot here mean ‘hasten’—as it apparently does in verse 17^a—we should perhaps read תקץ or תקוץ ‘abhor,’ which agrees with the Gr. *μὴ μισήσῃς* (cf. chap. vi 25 and Prov. iii 11).

xiii 9. וכדי כן יגישך can scarcely be translated ‘so much the more he will approach thee’ (in spite of Amos ix 10), but means rather ‘so much the more he will cause thee to approach,’ cf. the Gr. and the Syr.

xiii 11. אל תבטח לחפש עמו. For לחפש the Gr. has *ἰσηγορεῖσθαι*, the Syr. ܠܡܡܠܠܘ ‘to speak,’ but neither rendering supports the view that חפש here means ‘freedom’ or ‘the act of speaking freely.’ The root חפש, it must be remembered, does not refer to freedom in general, but to the *release* of slaves, captives, and the like. Hence it is quite appropriate in chap. vii 21, but not in this passage. Possibly we should pronounce לְחַפֵּשׂ and translate ‘to argue,’ lit. ‘to investigate.’

xiii 12. אכזרי יתן מושל ולא יחמל. In the interpretation of this very difficult verse we must be guided chiefly by the context. Both in the passage before and in the passage after it the author is describing the cruelty and treachery of the rich in their dealings with the poor. For this reason the word מושל ‘ruler’ seems more suitable than שלום (i.e. שִׁלּוּם ‘vengeance,’ which is presupposed by the Syriac, or שָׁלוֹם ‘peace’). What reading is presupposed by the Gr. *ὁ μὴ συντηρῶν λόγους* it is impossible to say. But whether we read מושל or שלום, the preceding word יתן presents an insuperable difficulty. The rendering ‘he will *speak* peace’ is wholly unsupported by usage, for נתן שלום means to *establish* peace (Lev. xxvi 6, 1 Chron. xxii 8). Perhaps we should read אכזר כַּפֶּתֶן מושל ‘a ruler is cruel as an asp,’ cf. Deut. xxxii 33 ראש פתנים אכזר ‘the cruel venom of asps.’ For the metaphor, compare verses 17 and 19, where the rich are likened to wolves and lions.

xiii 18. מאיש שלום צבוע אל כלב מאין שלום עשיר אל רש. In this verse the editors are doubtless right in regarding מאיש as a corruption of מֵאַיִן. But we must also read שׁוֹלֵם 'agreeing' instead of שלום, according to Ps. vii 5. This use of the verb ܫܠܶܡ (followed by ܠ) is very common in Syriac.

xiv 1. אשרי אנוש לא עצבו פיהו ולא אבה עליו דין לבו. For the latter half of the verse the Gr. has *καὶ οὐ κατενύγη ἐν λύπῃ ἁμαρτίας.* What *ἁμαρτίας* represents is not clear, but the translator seems to have read, or conjectured, אנה (or נאנח) for אבה, cf. chaps. xii 12 and xlvii 20. The Greek *λύπῃ* presupposes דון, i.e. דְּוָן, instead of דין, as Dr. Taylor remarks; if we adopt this reading, and at the same time substitute אִנָּה for אבה, the sense will be 'whose heart has not brought misery upon him' (cf. לא יאננה chap. xv 13). The subject (לבו) stands at the end of the clause because it answers to פיהו in the clause preceding.

xiv 5. ולא יקרה בטובתו. For יקרה the Gr. has *εὐφρανθήσεται* which points to a reading יחדה, cf. Ps. xxi 7 תְּחַדֵּהוּ Gr. *εὐφρανεῖς αὐτόν.* יקרה cannot be connected with קורת רוח 'refreshment of the spirit' (as is suggested in the Notes, p. 50), since in the latter case the root is קרר, not קרה. From the Syr. it would appear that the original reading יחדה was changed first to יקדה and further corrupted to יקרה.

xiv 12. וחוק לשאול לא הגד לך. The strange phrase חוק לשאול is not justified by chap. xxxviii 22. Probably we should read חֵלֶק שאול 'the destiny of death,' i.e. the destined hour of death. So ܚܶܠܩܳܐ ܕܡܰܘܬܳܐ is used in Syriac, e.g. in the *Scholia by Mār Jacob*, ed. Phillips (1864), p. 10, line 10.

xv 14. וישתיהו ביד חותפו ויתנהו ביד יצרו. That these two clauses are doublets is shown by the Gr. and the Syr. The synonyms וישתיהו (read וַיְשִׁיתֵהוּ) and ויתנהו present no difficulty, but how does חותפו 'his robber' correspond to יצרו 'his nature'? If the latter be the original reading, it is incredible that so obscure a term as חותפו should have been substituted for it by a scribe. Are we therefore to assume that Ben-Sira wrote חותפו? The context, apart from all other considerations, renders this view untenable; in a passage which insists so strongly on the principle that God is in no way responsible for evil the statement that God handed over man 'to him that should rob him' (i.e. to his *evil* nature) would be altogether inappropriate. To say that in Rabbinic literature the evil nature is sometimes called an 'enemy' (צר or שונא) is not to the point. *Here* the sense demands an assertion of man's free-will, and this we obtain by reading חירותו, according to the common Syriac use of ܚܐܪܘܬܐ for 'moral free-will.' יצר, like חירות, is a neutral term, i.e. it denotes inclination towards good *or* towards evil.

xv 20. ולא החלים אנשי כזב. Whether we take החלים as 'He made to dream' or 'He made healthy' (Is. xxxviii 16), it is impossible to extract a suitable sense from this clause as it stands. Perhaps we should read השליט 'He granted permission' (cf. Koheleth v 18, vi 2). This is the sense presupposed by the Gr. and Syr., though both versions translate freely.

xxxi 6. רבים היו חבולי זהב. For חבולי 'given in pledge' the margin has חללי 'slain,' the reading presupposed by the Gr. What the Syriac translator read we cannot say, as he renders vaguely 'rich.' Possibly we should read חֹמְלֵי 'storing up,' cf. Syr. ܡܚܰܡܠ. In the latter half of the verse the Syr. has ܩܶܢܝܳܢܗܘܢ i. e. קִנְיָנָם instead of פנינים.

xxxii 9. בין זקנים אל תקומם ושרים אל תרב לטרד. As קומם is always transitive in Hebrew (for from the corrupt passage Mic. ii 8 no conclusion can be drawn), it is perhaps better to read תֵּרוֹמָם cf. אֵרוֹמָם (pausal form) Is. xxxiii 10. The verb טרד seems here to mean 'occupy,' 'claim the attention' of a person, cf. the use of טָרוּד in post-Biblical Hebrew and of טְרִיד in Jewish Aramaic for 'busy.'

xxxii 9^{a}, 10. לפני ברד ינצח ברק. It is quite unnecessary to alter ינצח in this passage; נצח is here used in its proper sense 'to shine,' as sometimes in Syriac, and the non-assimilation of the נ in the Imperfect of this verb agrees with the Syriac form (ܢܶܢܨܰܚ). The more common meaning 'to conquer' is, of course, secondary.

xxxv 13 (Gr. 16). לא ישא פנים אל דל, Gr. *οὐ λήμψεται πρόσωπον ἐπὶ πτωχοῦ*. Here פנים אל דל can scarcely be taken as equivalent to פני דל (Lev. xix 15). Probably אל stands for על, as is often the case, 'He will not accept any person *against* a poor man' (Revised Version).

xxxvi 7. העיר אף ושפוך חמה. The phrase 'awake anger' (Gr. *ἔγειρον θυμόν*) is not in itself impossible (cf. Is. xlii 13, Ps. lxxviii 38, Dan. xi 25), but the context makes it probable that we should pronounce הַעַר 'pour out,' from ערה (cf. הֶעֱרָה Is. liii 12).

xxxvii 29. אל תזרע לכל תענוג marg. תזר אל and אל תזרו אל תענוג. In spite of Jer. iv 3 the reading תזרע can scarcely be right, for it is one thing to say 'sow towards (i. e. among) the thorns' and quite another thing to say 'sow to every luxury.' The reading (אל) אל תזר על gives a much better sense 'go not astray towards' (cf. זֹרוּ in parallelism with תָּעוּ Ps. lviii 4). In the second half of the verse, ואל תשפך על כל מטעמים, the word תשפך (for which the margin substitutes תתחנג) should perhaps be explained in accordance with שפכה (K. שֻׁפְּכוּ) in Ps. lxxiii 2 'my steps had well nigh slipped.'

xxxviii 14^{b}. אשר יצלח לו פשרה. Here פשרה seems to be most naturally explained by the Syr. ܦܘܫܳܪܐ 'digestion,' in which case the renderings of the versions (Gr. *ἀνάπαυσιν*, Syr. ܡܬܢܝܚܢܐ) are approximately right.

xxxviii 23. מושבת מתוושבת זכרו, marg. כשבות מת ישבות ז׳. This passage appears to show that in chap. xliv 9 וישבתו is a mistake for וישבת 'and *it* (i. e their memory) ceased when they ceased.'

xxxviii 26. ושקידתו לכלות מרבק. The rendering 'And his wakefulness (i. e. care) is to victual the stall' may suit the context, but the word לכלות remains unexplained. To read לבלות (as is suggested in the Notes, p. 62) does not remove the difficulty, for if ויבול (K. וַיָּבָל) in Judg. xix 21 means 'he gave provender' it is from the root בלל, so that the Infinitive would be בֹּל or בְּלֹל (like שְׁלֹל), not בלות. An abstract verbal noun בַּלּוֹת is also scarcely probable. But the Gr. *εἰς χορτάσματα δαμάλεων* shows that we should read לְעֶגְלוֹת מרבק 'for the heifers of the stall'—cf. 1 Sam. xxviii 24, Jer. xlvi 21.

A. A. Bevan.

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT.

(1) THE most important of recent Contributions to Old Testament Literature are to be found in the second volume of Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* which was published early in 1899. Mr. F. H. Woods contributes an article (candid, full, and interesting) on the FLOOD. A second article by the same writer gives a clear and adequate account of the results of modern criticism on the HEXATEUCH. Prof. Ryle writes on GENESIS an article which closes with two interesting sections on the *Historical Value* and on the *Religious Teaching* of the book. An important article on the conceptions of GOD in the Old Testament is from the pen of Prof. A. B. Davidson. Dr. Davidson writes of the means whereby God is known, of anthropomorphisms, of the meaning of the names and titles of God, with the learning and soberness of judgement which one always expects from the Edinburgh Professor. Another article by the same author is on HOSEA; it concludes with some interesting remarks on *Some General Ideas* of the book and some timely words on the *Integrity and Text.* A third article by Dr. Davidson treats of the book of JEREMIAH. It contains some pregnant sayings, e. g. on the Hebrew and Greek texts: 'Speaking generally, the MT is qualitatively greatly superior to the Gr.; but, on the other hand, quantitatively the Gr. is nearer the original text;' or again, on the religious ideas of the book, 'It is not certain that Jeremiah thought the lawbook altogether a good . . . Pharisaism and Deuteronomy came into the world the same day.' Professor Driver writes on HABAKKUK, and gives a comparatively full discussion of the important critical questions connected with chapters ii and iii. Dr. Driver's other longer articles are on JACOB and JOSEPH. The former contains an interesting discussion of the question, How far the narratives relating to Jacob are historical. The latter article (on JOSEPH) closes with a careful discussion extending over seven columns of the acquaintance shewn by the authors of the Joseph-narratives with the customs and institutions of Egypt. Mr. G. A. Cooke's article on HAGGAI is provided with useful footnotes dealing with difficulties in the text. Prof. G. A. Smith

writes an article on ISAIAH of twenty-seven columns, two of which are devoted to a brief but useful criticism of the views recently expressed by Duhm, Hackmann, and Cheyne as to the authenticity of many passages in chapters i–xxxiii not questioned by earlier critics. The article contains also a vigorous vindication of the pre-exilic date of the Messianic passages of these earlier chapters. A second contribution from Prof. Smith is a good article on the book of JOSHUA. Prof. W. T. Davison writes on JOB and has a good section on the *Scope and Design* of the book. The article JOEL is by Prof. S. S. Cameron. Prof. Ed. König of Rostock has written with great learning and at great length on JONAH. The same author also writes the article, JUDGES, twenty-four columns full of good philological and historical criticism. Lastly, Mr. C. F. Burney contributes an article on I, II KINGS, rather unattractive in form, but full of careful work in detail, and offering much help to other workers in similar fields.

(2) The latest volume (VI) of Hauck's *Realencyclopädie* does not contain much of importance for Old Testament study. FEUER UND WOLKENSÄULE is by v. Orelli, FREMDLINGE BEI DEN HEBRÄERN by Benzinger; GAD (a divinity) is fully treated by Wolf Baudissin; Fr. Buhl writes on GELÜBDE IM AT, P. Kleinert on GÖTZENDIENST IM AT.

Of recent Commentaries the following may be mentioned:—

(3) Prof. H. P. Smith's *Samuel* ('International Critical Commentary'), 1899. Brief and good, supplying also the introduction which is wanting in Driver's *Notes on Samuel*; less cautious than Driver in Textual Criticism.

(4) I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige* ('Kurzer Hand-Commentar'), 1899. Too meagre in parts (cf. e.g. note on 2 Kings xxiii 29 *b*); careful in Archaeology.

(5) B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, 1899. Radical in criticism like the *Jesaja* (1892) of the same author.

(6) R. Kittel, sixth edition 'vielfach umgearbeitet' of Dillmann's *Jesaja*, 1898. Kittel makes many important additions, e.g. a discussion (on ix 1 *ff*) of the objections of Volck and Hackmann to the genuineness of that prophecy.

(7) A. Bertholet, *Hesekiel* ('Kurzer Hand-Commentar'), 1897. Sensible; follows Cornill generally, but not blindly, in Criticism of the Text; the difficult passage vi 8, 9 is handled with skill and independence.

(8) A book important in its bearing upon the Old Testament is *Authority and Archaeology*, edited by D. G. Hogarth, 1899. It contains an essay of 150 pages on 'Hebrew Authority' (in its relation to archaeology), written by Prof. Driver, which for soberness of tone and adequacy

of treatment is certainly the best summary which has hitherto been given us. Besides throwing light on purely historical matters, the author gives (pp. 131–142) a very good collection of 'miscellaneous illustrations' derived from the monuments of names and titles found in the Old Testament.

(9) Another important book on the same subject is C. J. Ball's *Light from the East; or, the Witness of the Monuments*. This work contains many reproductions of original texts (as well as translations), and also numerous illustrations of antiquities.

(10) A still more important archaeological work is Lidzbarski's *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, 1898. It is edited with German completeness. Vol. I contains (*a*) a bibliography of 88 pages, (*b*) a history of the progress of the science of north Semitic epigraphy, (*c*) a classification of inscriptions and an explanation of the formulae used in them, (*d*) an account of the forms of letters, (*e*) a vocabulary of 200 pages, divided into two halves, arranged in parallel columns, giving the Aramaic and 'Canaanite' words found in inscriptions, (*f*) a good and adequate selection of north Semitic inscriptions transliterated into square 'Hebrew' characters. Vol. II contains the same inscriptions reproduced in facsimile.

(11) A second edition of Smend's *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* has recently appeared (1899). Many paragraphs have been re-arranged or re-written; notes have been added; sentences have been pruned. Altogether the revision seems to have been carefully executed, and though the number of the pages has been lessened, the value of the book has been increased. The treatment, e.g. of Isaiah, shows that the work has been brought up to the standard of present-day knowledge. The critical judgements are sober; Smend shows no willingness to be carried off his feet by such men as Volk and Hackmann.

(12) T. H. Weir, B.D., *A Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*. A small book, but useful as an introduction to the study of the text. Chapter vi ('Alteration of Original Documents') is a very useful summary.

(13) P. Corssen has published (Berlin, 1899) two new fragments (Ezek. xxxiii 7–11; Dan. xi 18–23) of the codex Weingartensis 'perhaps the best surviving [Old] Latin MS of the Prophets' (Burkitt). He has added a discussion on the relation of this MS to the Wirceburgensis, reprinting for comparison the passages common to both MSS in both texts. Corssen traces the two MSS to a common ancestor, and gives an interesting account of the state both of the Latin text and of the Greek from which it was taken.

Among recent contributions published in periodicals the following may be mentioned.

(*a*) Theologische Literaturzeitung.

June 10. Gesenius, *Heb. und Aram. Handwörterbuch über das A. T.* 13th ed., revised by Buhl: review by Schwally. Hoonacker, van, *Le Sacerdoce Lévitique*: review by Baudissin. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Part 6 (*Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islam*): review by Schürer.

June 24. Kirchhoff, *Palästinakunde* (about the plants, &c., of Palestine): review by Furrer.

Aug. 19. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium* ('Hand-Kommentar zum A. T.'): review by Bertholet.

(*b*) Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

1899, II. Baumann, *Die Verwendbarkeit der Pešita zum Buche Ijob für die Textkritik.*

(*c*) Studien und Kritiken.

1899, III. Steuernagel, *Der jehovistische Bericht über den Bundesschluss am Sinai.*

(*d*) Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1899 (Vol. liii).

I—Martin Schreiner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der theologischen Bewegungen im Islam* (continuation). Reviews—E. Sachau's *Muhammedanisches Recht nach schafiitischer Lehre* by C. Snouck Hurgronje (important). P. Jensen's *Hittiter und Armenier* by H. Zimmern.

II—F. Praetorius, *Ueber das babylonische Vokalisationssystem des Hebräischen.* Th. Nöldeke, *Zur Alexiuslegende.* E. W. Brooks, *The Chronological Canon of James of Edessa.* Reviews—W. Singer's *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Leptogenesis, Erster Theil: Tendenz und Ursprung* by E. Littmann. Carra de Vaux, *Le Mahométisme; le génie sémitique et le génie aryen dans l'Islam* by T. Goldziher.

( ) Journal Asiatique, Paris, 1899 (9ème Série) Tome xiii. I (Janvier–Février) J. Halévy on the geographical names Lapana, חמת and חדרך. II (Mars–Avril) J. Halévy, *La date du Déluge, Le mariage d'Osée.*

(*f*) Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.

1899, II. L. Fonck, *Kritik und Tradition im A. T.* III. F. Walter, *Das Prophetenthum in seinem socialen Berufe.*

W. E. B. (A.A.B., F.C.B.).

PATRISTICA I.

(1) THE year 1899 has seen the appearance of the second and third volumes of the Berlin edition of the Greek ante-Nicene Fathers, so that it looks as if for the future the promised average of two volumes a year may really be kept up. Both the new volumes deal with Origen: both are edited by Dr. Paul Kötschau, of Jena, who has already written on the subject in *Texte und Untersuchungen*. The one volume contains the *de Martyrio* and the first four books of the *contra Celsum*, the other the remaining four of the *contra Celsum* with the *de Oratione*. It will thus be seen that, putting these together with the Cambridge editions the *Philocalia* and the *In Ioannem*, the publication of the extant eek of Origen is in a fair way to completion. The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES hopes to give in a later number a detailed review of Dr. Kötschau's important work, and contents itself therefore at the present moment with chronicling its appearance.

(2) The same number of volumes has been issued within the last twelve months by the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vol. 39, *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi IIII–VIII*, edited by Paul Geyer, is a collection in chronological order of the following nine pilgrimages to the Holy Land or descriptions of the Holy Places. (i) *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (three manuscripts of the ninth and tenth century), the journey of an anonymous pilgrim of the year 333, gives in complete detail the route, stopping-places (*ciuitates*, *mansiones*, *mutationes*) and distances from Bordeaux by land through Arles, Milan, Aquileia, Sirmium, Sardica, Constantinople, Nicomedia, Ancyra, Tarsus, Antioch, Tyre, and Caesarea to Jerusalem, back to Constantinople, and then by Heraclea across Macedonia and Epirus to Aulona, over the Adriatic to Hydruntum, by Capua to Rome, and back to the old route at Milan. The description of Holy Places is very brief, and they are for the most part connected with Old Testament characters; the exceptions are: at Caesarea, the bath of Cornelius the centurion; at 'Sichar' the well where Christ sat; at Jerusalem the pool of 'Betsaida' (but the MS evidence is for 'Betaida'), the pinnacle of the Temptation, the site of 'Caifas' house, with the column of the flagellation, the ruins of Pilate's palace, the hill (*monticulus*) Golgotha, and, a stone's-throw off, Constantine's new basilica over the burial-place of Christ; the stone where Judas betrayed Christ, the palm-tree whose branches were strewn before Christ; on Mount Olivet a basilica of Constantine on the site where Christ taught the apostles before His Passion, and, 'not far off,' the hill of the Transfiguration; at Bethany the tomb of Lazarus; at Jericho Zacchaeus' 'sicomore' tree; at Jordan, the site of the Baptism; at Bethlehem, the site of the Nativity, with a third basilica of Constan-

tine. It goes without saying that with each later pilgrim the number of relics multiplies apace. (ii) *S. Siluiae Peregrinatio* (one MS of the eleventh century, defective at either end, originally from Monte Cassino, now at Arezzo) is the latest discovered (in 1884, by Gamurrini), and perhaps the most interesting, of all the pilgrimages. The pilgrim was a lady from Gaul—conjecturally identified by Gamurrini (Geyer records his dissent) with Silvia, sister of Rufinus, minister of Theodosius the Great—who, some fifty years after the Bordeaux pilgrim, visited Mount Sinai, Arabia, the Jordan Valley, Jerusalem, Antioch, Edessa, Tarsus, Seleucia, Chalcedon and Constantinople, from which place she sends the account of her three years' wanderings to her 'sisters' at home. The unique feature of this account is the very lengthy account of the Church services at Jerusalem, which Duchesne has made generally known by printing it as an appendix to his *Origines du culte chrétien*[1]. (iii) *Petri diaconi liber de locis sanctis*, printed from the autograph of the compiler, a twelfth-century deacon at Monte Cassino, is put together at second-hand, mostly from Bede, but partly from Silvia, and is only of interest as apparently containing some of the lost portions of the latter. (iv) *Eucherii de situ Hierusolimitanae urbis atque ipsius Iudaeae epistola ad Faustum* (two MSS of the eighth century) is simply a short geographical description, also at second-hand: of written authorities, Jerome and the Latin Josephus are quoted. (v) *Theodosius de situ terrae sanctae* (three MSS of the eighth and ninth centuries) is a somewhat similar compilation, but more interesting because the geographical is subordinated to the historical and hagiographical information. Of the author even his name is uncertain: the date, from several mentions of the Emperor Anastasius, may be conjectured to be in the first half of the sixth century. The progress of church building in the two centuries since the Bordeaux pilgrim may be illustrated by the fact that instead of one church on the Mount of Olives there were now twenty-four: in Jerusalem the churches of St. Mary, St. Peter, St. Stephen, and the Holy Wisdom are now mentioned; the church of Sion, 'the mother of all churches,' is now said to have been founded by 'our Lord Christ with the apostles.' The new sites and relics are too numerous to catalogue. Mention is made of the seven sleepers of Ephesus, with their dog. Of Lazarus we are told that no man knows of his second death. The Invention of Holy Cross by Helena is observed from *a. d. xvii kal. Oct.* (Sept. 15) by an octave of masses in the church of the Holy Sepulchre and by the exposition of the Cross itself. (vi) *Breuiarius de Hierosolyma* (two MSS of the eleventh and ninth centuries) is a very brief description of the sites in Jerusalem itself, but marks a considerable advance in the production of relics—the dish on which the Baptist's head was carried, the Cup of the Last Supper, the crown of thorns, the reed, sponge and spear of the Crucifixion, the stone of the sepulchre, the stone of St. Stephen's martyrdom. (vii) *Antonini Placentini Itinerarium* (printed in two recensions, each from ninth and tenth-century MSS[1]) is really the story of a companion of 'blessed Antoninus the martyr' of Piacenza, written not long after the reign of Justinian. The system of relics has been carried to a high degree of perfection; we hear of the couch at Cana of Galilee—tourists are much alike in all centuries, and our author wrote his parents' names on it—with two of the waterpots, the Virgin Mary's seat at the Annunciation, our Lord's *a b c d* book, the chain by which Judas hung himself, and, oddest of all, the stone which the builders rejected, and the dew which coming from Hermon fell nightly on the hill of Sion. One feels there was nothing the pious man would have stuck at, and one wonders whether some good monk had been playing on his credulity when he tells us that the peculiarity of the Dead Sea was that nothing could float there! It is interesting to note that a use of 'lights and incense,' *luminaria et incensum*, is thrice mentioned (163. 19, 177. 6, 179. 6). (viii) *Adamnani de locis sanctis libri tres* (22 MSS, none before 800 A.D.) is a record taken down by the well-known Abbot of Iona of the personal experiences of a Gallic bishop, Arculf (*c.* A.D. 670), specially interesting as giving plans of the more important holy places at Jerusalem. (ix) *Baedae liber de locis sanctis* was the most popular of all accounts of the Holy Land, and is preserved in numerous MSS. But as it is exclusively compiled out of older extant narratives, its historical interest is but small. It concludes the series and the volume. Our best thanks are due to the editor who has collected and carefully edited the various fragments of this curious and not unattractive department of the literature of Christian antiquity.

---

[1] It may be mentioned that the service of the Veneration of the Cross on Good Friday already existed at Jerusalem at the date of Silvia's visit (88, 12–22).

(3) Vol. 40 of the same *Corpus S. E. L.* contains *Sancti Aurelii Augustini episcopi de Ciuitate Dei; pars I, libri I–XIII*, edited by Emanuel Hoffmann, who appears to have begun work at this book more than thirty years ago. It was perhaps natural that the Vienna series should open with the lesser Latin authors, whose writings were at once smaller in extent and preserved in fewer MSS. Even now St. Jerome and St. Gregory the Great are untouched; and it was twenty-five years from the commencement of the series when the first portion of St. Augustine appeared in 1891. Since then, however, the parts have been appearing in quick succession, and the

---

[1] Neither Geyer nor his predecessor Gildemeister (*Antonini Placentini Itinerarium*, Berlin, H. Reuther, 1889) reckons, among the MSS known to them, Bodl. 391—on which MS see also below—fol. 136 *b*, where an early thirteenth-century hand gives Antoninus in the same recension (but as it would seem in a much less corruptly preserved form of it) as Gildemeister's λ, a lost MS of Angers.

present is the sixth instalment of St. Augustine's works. We possessed already at the hands of B. Dombart (ed. 1, 1863, ed. 2, 1877) an edition of the *de Ciuitate*, which textually marked a great advance on the Benedictines; but even Dombart had complete collations in his first edition of none, in his second of only one, of the three oldest and least interpolated MSS—a Lyons MS of the sixth century (books i–v), a Paris MS from Corbie of the seventh century (books i–ix), and a Verona MS of the sixth (books xi–xvi). It is instructive to note that the MS which Hoffmann ranks next in value, and which forms his primary authority for book x, is a quite late Padua MS of the fourteenth century. It may be hoped that after the labours of these two scholars the text is finally settled; but the task of the historian and the annotator still remains.

(4) The first two parts of the fourth volume of the *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien* edited by Professors Knöpfler of Munich, Schrörs of Bonn, and Sdralek of Breslau (Münster i. W. 1898) contain elaborate introductions and annotations to the *de Viris Illustribus* of Gennadius of Marseilles Isidore of Seville and Ildefonsus of Toledo[1], the text being repeated from the latest editions—in Gennadius' case Richardson's (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xiv 1), in the others Arevalo's. These little treatises are the nearest approach which Latin Christian antiquity possessed to a biographical dictionary; though no doubt not always trustworthy, they fill up many gaps in our knowledge and are well worth the labour lavished on them in this volume. The main portion of the work consists in each case of a historical commentary on the various lives, tracing the sources, distinguishing the true from the false, and adding many useful references to modern discussions: Gennadius is then further discussed under the heads 'personality of Gennadius according to his *Catalogue of Writers*,' 'his sources and manner of using them,' 'his partiality and dogmatic position,' 'chronology in the *Catalogue* and date of its composition'; Isidore under the heads 'integrity of Isidore's *de Viris*,' 'the manuscripts[2],' 'the date of composition,' 'the sources,' 'use made of the sources,' 'value of the work'; Ildefonsus under 'value of the individual chapters,' 'the bishops of Toledo in the *Catalogue*,' 'object of the *Catalogue*.'

---

[1] *Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker: eine quellenkritische Untersuchung . . von Bruno Czapla: Isidor und Ildefons als Litterarhistoriker: eine quellenkritische Untersuchung . . von Gustav von Dzialowski.* Jerome's *de Viris* was similarly treated in the second volume of the same series.

[2] Two Bodleian MSS—Bodl. 391 from Canterbury, written *c.* 1125–1150, and Bodl. e Mus. 31 from Bury St. Edmund's, written 1150–1200—both give Isidore's *de Viris* in the shorter form, omitting lives 1–4, 6–13. But the similarity of the contents shows that the two MSS descend from a single exemplar: the only treatise peculiar to either is the *Antoninus Placentinus* of Bodl. 391 already referred to, and that is written at the end of the MS in a later hand.

(5) The third part of the same volume is a translation (into German), with introduction, of the treatise *de sancta Nicaena synodo* of the Syriac bishop Maruta of Maipherkat, by Prof. Oscar Braun of Würzburg. Maruta was sent as ambassador from Arcadius to the Persian king Jezdegerd, on the latter's accession in A.D. 399, when, after the long persecution under Sapor II and his son, the Persian Christians were at length able to re-organize their shattered forces. In this re-organization Maruta took a leading part, collecting the records of the martyrdoms, consecrating a catholikos of Seleucia, after a vacancy of twenty years, and assisting at more than one synod. It was perhaps not till the second of these synods, A.D. 410, that Maruta proposed a *corpus iuris* for the Persian Church, consisting of a volume of canons labelled 'Nicene,' which, with the Nicene Creed, were subscribed and ratified by all the bishops. So far the known records of history: what Dr. Braun has now discovered (in an unfortunately very imperfect Syriac MS at the Propaganda in Rome) purports to be the actual 'Nicene' collection of Maruta himself. The contents are (*a*) genuinely Nicene fragments; canons 15–20, the list of signatures, the edict of Constantine against the writings of Arius: (*b*) pseudo-Nicene; 73 canons: (*c*) genuine Maruta fragments; letter to the catholikos Isaac, catalogue of heresies: (*d*) probably or certainly later than Maruta; history of Constantine Helena and the Nicene council, explanation of the technical words used in the canons, with a history of monasticism, explanation of the Nicene [Constantinopolitan] Creed. The text of the genuine canons differs from the only published Syriac text, that of the Abbé Martin; but as the British Museum MSS are known to differ from Martin's text, they may conceivably agree with Braun's[1]. But the real interest of Maruta's collection lies not in his genuine but in his spurious Nicene documents; for the seventy-three canons are an earlier and more original form of the eighty or eighty-four canons known in Arabic. It is clear that the Mesopotamian colouring of the code, which is common to both forms, is primitive, and that the Egyptian element in the Arabic canons is interpolated; and everything would hang together excellently if we could suppose with Dr. Braun that we have here the *corpus iuris* drawn up by Maruta for the Persians in A.D. 410, and placed for greater acceptance under the sanction of the name Nicene. But it must be admitted that not all the contents suggest *prima facie* quite so early a date.

(6) One section of Dr. Braun's discovery, Maruta's *Catalogue of*

---

[1] The list of Nicene signatures of the oldest of these B. M. Syriac MSS has however been printed, and agrees remarkably with Dr. Braun's list; but according to Dr. Braun the two lists diverge too far in their transliteration of Greek names for a common *Syriac* origin to be possible.

Heresies, is the subject of a short monograph by Harnack in *Texte und Untersuchungen* (new series iv. 1), who shows that the contents exactly suit a Syriac origin of the date *c.* 400 A. D., and that in several cases Maruta must be ranked as an independent authority giving us new information—the Bardesanites always dressed in white, the Montanists observed four fasts of forty days in the year, and so on—while in the case of the Paulicians his *data* are 'the best which we possess at all[1].' We note a characteristic attempt to connect the statement that the Montanists 'call Blessed Mary a goddess, and say that an Archon had intercourse with her,' with the introduction of the term θεοτόκος.

(7) 'Ingenious but baseless' will be the verdict of Cyprianic scholars on the attempt of K. G. Goetz, *Der alte Anfang und die ursprüngliche Form von Cyprian's Schrift ad Donatum* (in the same part of *Texte u. U.* as the preceding), to maintain the genuineness of an address from Donatus to Cyprian, occasionally found as the opening words of the *Ad Donatum*. Goetz has not attempted to find any further authority than two (related) MSS of Hartel's and one of Pamelius.' I have looked up four Bodleian MSS (one of them sister to the important Vatican MS T), and the words in question are absent from all of them. They doubtless originated in some early scholar who considered, like Goetz, that Cyprian's opening, *Bene admones Donate carissime promisisse me*, was impossibly abrupt, unless some remark from Donatus preceded it; but though the forger has caught the ring of some Cyprianic phrases, he betrays himself hopelessly with his *sanctissime Cypriane*. The ordinary opening, abrupt though it be, is far more like Cyprian's Ciceronian models than these five lines from Donatus would be. And Rufinus (quoted in Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 13) surely had a text which began with the *Bene admones*.

(8) To a previous volume of *Texte und Untersuchungen* (new series, ii 3 *b*), but also to the year 1899, belongs a discussion of the authorities for the text of the fragments of the Arian historian Philostorgius, *Zur Ueberlieferung des Philostorgios*, by Prof. Jeep of Königsberg. Few losses have been so serious for the history of the early Church as the loss of Philostorgius. He was indeed read and used by the Catholic historians of the fifth century, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret: Photius, in the ninth century, not only describes him in his *Bibliotheca*, but composed an epitome of his history[2]: but unorthodox writers drop gradually out of circulation, and, except Suidas and Nicetas, later writers such as Nicephorus Callistus knew Philostorgius only in Photius'

---

[1] The careful details about the relation of each sect to the Scriptures shows, I may add, community of authorship with the first of the pseudo-Nicene canons (see above).

[2] Dr. Jeep's defence of Photius' authorship appears to be quite convincing.

epitome. The manuscripts of this epitome, which is now our main source of knowledge, all derive, Dr. Jeep shows, from a single extant exemplar in the Bodleian, Baroccianus 142: on this MS then, with the help of the Philostorgian matter in Nicephorus, will rest the edition of Philostorgius, whenever it comes, which is to supersede that of Valesius.

(9) In the various numbers of the *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, Belgium) during 1899 are several papers by Dom Germain Morin, which merit mention here. (i) Feb.: *D'où était évêque Nicasius, l'unique représentant des Gaules au concile de Nicée?* Dom Morin finds that the lists collected in Gelzer, Hilgenfeld and Cuntz *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* only confirm the view, now commonly received, that Nicasius' see was at Die in Dauphiné. (ii) May: *Notes sur divers manuscrits*, the first of them a Namur MS of the *De locis sanctis* of Bede (see above 2, ix). (iii) March: *Le Testament de S. Césaire d'Arles et la critique de M. Bruno Krusch.* Krusch edited the lives of the saints of the Merovingian age in the *Monumenta Germaniae* (1896) and scattered verdicts of spuriousness all round, *inter alia* against the will made by Caesarius of Arles (*ob.* 543) in favour of the monastery of virgins he had founded. Dom Morin first gives us an improved text of the *Testamentum*, and then demonstrates, on the one side, the close resemblance of style with Caesarius' acknowledged works, and, on the other, the historical baselessness of all Krusch's arguments. (iv) June–August: *Un nouveau recueil inédit d'homélies de S. Césaire d'Arles.* A Paris MS, lat. 2768 A (saec. x: from St. Martial at Limoges), contains among other pieces a collection of fifteen homilies under the title *Epistulae sancti Augustini*, the authorship or editorship of which Dom Morin has no difficulty in vindicating for Caesarius. The introduction and conclusion of each homily contain familiar Caesarian phrases: the body of the homily is generally taken with slight changes from the genuine sermons of Augustine—a procedure again thoroughly Caesarian. Some of the fifteen are already in print in the Appendix to the Benedictine Augustine: the remainder are printed for the first time in these numbers of the *Revue.*

(10) But by far the most important of Dom Morin's recent contributions to patristic studies is his article in the second number for this year of the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (Paris, 1899), entitled *L'Ambrosiaster et le juif converti Isaac, contemporain du pape Damase.* Ambrosiaster, as is well known, is the name given, for purposes of convenience, to the author of a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles which Augustine used as 'saint Hilary's,' which the early middle ages attributed to St. Ambrose, and for which modern scholars have suggested one name after another. It is certain that this writer was a contemporary of Pope Damasus (366–384): it is all but certain

that he lived and wrote at Rome, and that to him belongs also the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, printed in the appendix to the first part of the third volume of the Benedictine Augustine. It is certain that he was not either a bishop or a deacon, for he almost equalizes the office of bishop and priest, and he attacks the *iactantia Romanorum Leuitarum*: Dom Morin shows further that the arguments for his being a priest are less cogent than those which make him out a layman, and illustrates lay interest in theology from the examples of Ambrosiaster's contemporaries, Tyconius and Marius Victorinus (he might have added from the next half century Marius Mercator)[1]. He was also, and this Dom Morin is the first to point out, unusually well informed in all that pertained to Judaism. He is acquainted with Jewish legends about the sepulchre of Moses and the demons who served Solomon, and with Jewish apocrypha like the Apocalypse of Elias and the book of Jannes and Jambres, from both of which he supposes St. Paul to borrow. He knows the customs of the synagogue, the right of the *seniores* to be consulted, the appointment of masters to teach the children, the being seated at disputations—whether on chairs, on benches, or on the ground, according to rank. Dom Morin then reminds us that history tells us of a converted Jew, of the name of Isaac, who played a not unimportant part in the troubles at Rome which accompanied the rival elections in 366 of Damasus and Ursinus. Isaac was a leader of the party of Ursinus, and carried on for many years a campaign which all but culminated in the condemnation of Damasus in the civil courts. The Pope was saved by the Emperor's intervention. Isaac was banished to Spain (*c.* 378 A. D.), and in chagrin at his ill-success fell back into Judaism. But if Isaac was the Ambrosiaster of the Commentary, it is easy to understand, what has hitherto been so unintelligible, why Jerome nowhere alludes to his work even when commenting on the same epistles: the faithful henchman of Damasus boycotted the apostate Jew. It only remains to add that Isaac is mentioned as a theological author by Gennadius of Marseilles, and that a fragment on the Trinity and Incarnation preserved in a Paris MS of canons, under the name *Fides Isatis ex Iudaeo*, 'of Isaac the ex-Jew,' presents striking similarities of language with Ambrosiaster and the *Quaestiones*. On a review of these arguments it seems hardly premature to say that Dom Morin has solved one of the great problems of patristic literature.

---

[1] Our readers will be interested to note that Dom Morin adds: 'Il y a encore aujourd'hui, notamment parmi les anglicans ritualistes, des laïques plus lancés dans les discussions religieuses que les ecclesiastiques eux-mêmes,' p. 117. A similar interest in our ecclesiastical politics is manifested in an earlier passage (p. 113): 'On peut voir, rien que par certaines productions dues à la plume de catholiques anglais de notre temps, que les convertis ne sont pas généralement des plus tendres envers leurs anciens coreligionnaires.'

Such, at any rate, is the opinion of Dr. Zahn as expressed in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for July 7.

(11) Not all the volumes of the series of Byzantine texts which Messrs. Methuen are publishing, and of which Professor Bury, the most competent of editors, has charge, will be sufficiently related to theological studies to be described here. But we are glad of the occasion to commend this admirable undertaking which offers itself in connexion with one of the two authors already published, Evagrius [1], who carries on the thread of eastern Church history for a century and a half from the point where the earlier historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, break off: for *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, as edited with introduction, critical notes, and indices by two Belgian scholars, MM. Bidez and Parmentier, appears to be the model of what such an edition should be—with its clear introduction on the MSS, full but not burdensome critical apparatus, copious marginal references, exhaustive indices, and attractive type.

C. H. T.

---

[1] The companion volume is the *History of Michael Psellus*, edited by Constantine Sathas.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

Church Quarterly Review, July 1899 (No. 96, Vol. xlviii: Spottiswoode & Co.). The 'Hearing' at Lambeth on Incense—The new Dictionary of the Bible, vol. ii—Pastor's History of the Popes—An American view of the post-apostolic age—Spiritual letters of Dr. Pusey—The hidden history of the Oxford Movement—Evolutionist Autobiography—The life of Shakespeare—The beginnings of the Reformation—The three Creeds—The episcopate of Bishop Charles Wordsworth—The Bishop of Oxford's Charge—Short Notices.

Jewish Quarterly Review, July 1899 (Vol. xi, No. 44: Macmillan & Co.). G. MARGOLIOUTH Responses of Maimonides in the original Arabic—T. K. CHEYNE The N. Arabian land of Muṣri in early Hebrew tradition—T. K. CHEYNE Gleanings in Biblical Criticism—Miss N. DAVIS Poetry: The Ages of Man—A. FELDMAN The Bible in Neo-Hebraic poetry—M. STEINSCHNEIDER An Introduction to the Arabic literature of the Jews: I (*continued*)—I. ABRAHAMS Professor Schürer on Life under the Jewish Law—S. SCHECHTER Geniza Specimens: A Letter of Chushiel—W. BACHER Notes on the Critique of the Text of the Targum of the Prophets—Miscellanea: D. KAUFMANN, D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, S. KRAUSS, E. N. ADLER—Critical Notices—Notes to the J. Q. R., xi 364–386: S. J. HALBERSTAM, A. NEUBAUER.

Expositor, July 1899 (Fifth Series, No. 55: Hodder & Stoughton). J. WATSON The Doctrines of Grace: (5) The Vicarious Sacrifice of Jesus Christ—W. M. RAMSAY A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians—T. K. CHEYNE Something better than Husks—A. BLACK The Twenty-third Psalm—H. J. C. KNIGHT On the relation of the Discourses of our Lord recorded in St. John iii and vi to the Institution of the two Sacraments—N. J. D. WHITE The Appearances of the Risen Lord to Individuals—M. DODS Survey of recent English Literature on the New Testament.

August 1899 (No. 56). J. R. ILLINGWORTH The 'Mystical' and

'Sacramental' Temperaments—A. B. DAVIDSON The word 'Atone' in Extra-ritual Literature—W. M. RAMSAY A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians—J. MONRO GIBSON Apocalyptic Sketches: (7) The Seven Vials—J. WATSON The Doctrines of Grace: (6) The Sovereignty of God—A. N. JANNARIS Misreadings and Misrenderings in the New Testament: (3) Errors of Interpretation—G. MILLIGAN The place of writing and destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

September 1899 (No. 57). J. Y. SIMPSON Father John in relation to the Russian Church—J. H. KENNEDY St. Paul's Correspondence with Corinth—W. M. RAMSAY A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians—J. WATSON The Doctrines of Grace: (7) Good Works—J. MONRO GIBSON Apocalyptic Sketches: (8) The Scarlet Woman and her Fate—T. K. CHEYNE Geographical Gains from Textual Criticism—A. A. BURD Moses the Angelic Mediator.

(2) AMERICAN.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, July 1899 (Vol. x, No. 39: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). M. C. WILLIAMS The Crisis in the Church of England—D. S. GREGORY 'Our Great Philosopher' *versus* The Known God—J. OMAN The Text of the Minor Prophets—B. B. WARFIELD 'It says:' 'Scripture says:' 'God says'—T. NICHOLS Morality: Intuitive and Imperative—D. MOORE Critics and Apologists—H. C. MINTON Récéjac on Mystic Knowledge—C. A. SALMOND The Princeton 'Students' Lectureship on Missions'—A. D. BARBER Dr. Strong's Theology of the Poets—Recent Theological Literature.

The American Journal of Theology, July 1899 (Vol. iii, No. 3: Chicago, University Press). I. Articles. F. LOOFS Has the Gospel of the Reformation become antiquated?—G. F. GENUNG Personality from the Monistic point of view—K. BUDDE The so-called 'Ebed-Yahweh Songs' and the meaning of the term 'Servant of Yahweh' in Isaiah, chaps. xl–lv. II. Critical and Historical Notes—J. RENDEL HARRIS The double text of Tobit: contribution towards a critical inquiry—G. BONET-MAURY The Edict of Tolerance of Louis XVI (1787) and its American promoters—C. R. GREGORY The Essay *Contra Novatianum*—M. R. VINCENT Some aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle: part ii. III. Recent Theological Literature.

(3) FRENCH.

Revue Biblique, July 1899 (Vol. viii, No. 3: Paris, V. Lecoffre; for the school of the Dominican convent of St. Stephen of Jerusalem). BATIFFOL Une source nouvelle de l'*Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*—R. P. ROSE Etudes évangéliques: Le royaume de Dieu, sa spiritualité et son universalité—R. P. LAGRANGE Le Sinaï

biblique—ROUVIER Ptolémaïs-Acé—Mélanges: R. P. CONDAMIN La réponse de Jésus aux Juifs Jo. viii 25: LÉVESQVE Les mots égyptiens dans l'histoire de Joseph: R. P. GERMER DURAND Epigraphie palestinienne, nouveaux milliaires: CLERMONT-GANNEAU et R. P. LAGRANGE Gezer: R. P. CALMES L'Introduction au Nouveau Testament—Chronique. Notes archéologiques et nouvelles: R. P. VINCENT Les fouilles anglaises à Tell Zakariya—Recensions—Bulletin.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 2: Paris, A. Picard). Lettre autographe de S. S. Léon XIII, adressée au Directeur de la *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*—BARON D'AVRIL Les Hiérarchies en Orient—DOM PARISOT La bibliothèque du séminaire syrien de Charfé—ABBÉ F. NAU Opuscules Maronites—R. P. PETIT Règlements généraux de l'Eglise Orthodoxe en Turquie (*suite*)—MGR. GRAFFIN Le synode de Mar Jésuyab—J. CLÉDAT Fragment d'une version copte de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean—A. GASTOUÉ La grande doxologie: étude critique—Bibliographie.

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses, July–August 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 4: Paris, 74 Boulevard Saint-Germain). J. TURMEL Histoire de l'Angélologie depuis le faux Denys l'Aréopagite; (2) Le diable et les démons—H. MARGIVAL Richard Simon et la critique biblique au xvii^e siècle; (11) L'affaire du Nouveau-Testament de Trévoux—P. CHAVANNE Le Patriotisme de Prudence; (1) Prudence et Rome considérée comme capitale du monde—Chronique d'histoire générale de l'Eglise, H.-M. HEMMER—Chronique d'histoire moderne de l'Eglise; la Compagnie de Jésus, A. DUBOIS—Ancienne philologie chrétienne; (1) Ouvrages généraux, (2) Deuxième siècle, P. LEJAY.

(4) GERMAN.

Theologische Quartalschrift, 1899 (Vol. lxxxi, No. 3: Ravensburg). FUNK Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas—SCHANZ Form und Intention bei den Sakramenten—A. KOCH Bischof Dr. F. X. von Linsenmann—H. KOCH Vincentius von Lerinum und Marius Mercator—FUNK Zur Frage nach den Katechumenatsklassen—Reviews—Analecta.

Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, July 1899 (Vol. xxii, No. 3: Leipzig, O. Reisland). A. KLOEPPER Das 21. Capitel des 4. Evangeliums—A. HILGENFELD Nachwort zu *Acta Apostolorum graece et latine*—G. HOENNICKE Der Hospitalorden im Königreich Jerusalem 1099–1187—J. DRAESECKE Zum Hesychastenstreit—F. GOERRES Miscellen zur späteren spanisch-westgothischen Kirchen- und Culturgeschichte—A. HILGENFELD Noch einmal der Adler des Ezra-Propheten—E. VON DOBSCHUETZ Zum Lentulus-Briefe—Notices.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, July 1899 (Vol. ix, No. 4: Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr). A. Hoffmann Vernunft und Offenbarung—J. Gottschick Schuld und Freiheit: kritische Bedenken.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1899, part 4 (Gotha: A. Perthes). I. Articles: Baur Gott als Vater im Alten Testament—Beyschlag Die neueste Zurechtlegung der Auferstehungsberichte—Feine Eph. ii 14–16—Wiesinger Der Gedankengang des ersten Johannesbriefes—Becker Luthers Beziehungen zu Zerbst. II. Notes: Wolff Zur Frage der Gebetserhörung—Drews Ein Originalbrief Luthers und zwei Originalbriefe Melanchthons—Frederiksen Ein Vorschlag zu Ps. cx 3*b*—Moeller Die Anselmsche Satisfaktio und die Busse des germanischen Strafrechts. III. Reviews: D. Martin Luthers Werke, kritische Gesamtausgabe, by W. Koehler.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, July 1899 (Vol. x, No. 7: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). R. Steinmetz Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons nach Godet—K. Stange Zum Sprachgebrauch der Rechtfertigungslehre in der Apologie—E. Broese Zur Auslegung von Röm. i 3, 4—K. Endemann Dr. W. Koelling und 1 Jo. v 7, 8—O. Naumann Friedrich Nietzsches antichristliche Philosophie.

August 1899 (Vol. x, No. 8). R. Rocholl Viktor von Strauss und Torney—Fr. Walther Das Wesen der Liebe zu Gott—E. Broese Wird Christus Röm. ix 5 ΘΕΟΣ genannt?—V. Schultze Das Testament des Waldeckischen Reformators Johann Hefentreger—O. Naumann Friedrich Nietzsches antichristliche Philosophie (*Schluss*).

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1900

A NEW WORK ON THE PARABLES[1].

PROFESSOR ADOLF JÜLICHER of Marburg is a writer of some note among the younger German Professors. He is conspicuously able in the narrower sense of the word, i. e. he has a strong grasp of his own position, and he writes forcibly and logically. Judging by a German rather than an English standard, he might be described as belonging to the Left Centre or more Conservative Left. His robust judgement is intolerant of absurdity and exaggeration on either side; and he is not a slave to the tradition of any particular school. He exercises to the full German freedom in criticism, but he takes his own impressions freshly from the facts with much independence and honesty of purpose.

Jülicher is best known for his elaborate work on the Parables, of which the first volume appeared eleven years ago, and the second—quickly followed by a new edition (largely rewritten) of the first—in 1899. But he has also brought out an *Introduction to the New Testament* which holds a good place in the series of compact handbooks (*Grundrisse*) published by Mohr of Freiburg and Leipzig. It may help to define his standpoint to say that, while rejecting the Pastoral Epistles, he goes further than up to that time (1894) Liberal theologians generally had gone, in accepting not only Colossians, but even the more strongly opposed Ephesians as possibly (he will not say more) a genuine work of St. Paul. In this he marked a tendency which has since been still more clearly pronounced. He also accepts 2 Thessalonians. And it is characteristic that he is a more uncompromising critic of the Fourth Gospel than e. g. either Schürer or Harnack.

---

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2 vols., vol. i in second edition), Freiburg i. B., &c., 1899.

The following pages may perhaps throw some light on the mental physiognomy which finds its natural expression in these views. I do not know any of the younger Germans who reminds me so much of the 'vigour and rigour' which Matthew Arnold found in the Tübingen criticism. By no means all the Tübingen critics had really what we should call the attribute of 'vigour.' Jülicher has this in a higher degree than most of them; and if in his case the 'rigour' is not that of the school, or of any preconceived philosophy, it is, I believe, all the more an inborn quality of the man. Half measures, subtle distinctions, the finer shades of delineation do not come to him so naturally as clear, definite, trenchant statement which does not admit of exceptions.

In dealing with the Parables, Jülicher's great object is to get rid at all costs of allegory. He holds that to represent the Parables as elaborate compositions, in which a number of points on the one side correspond to a number of points on the other, is to import into them something to which they were originally foreign. He believes that in their origin they were quite simple. Their object being to illustrate and enforce, he regards it as a contradiction that they should themselves need lengthy interpretations. He will not allow any one parable to carry with it more than a single lesson or moral. And that lesson or moral is not to result from any single feature, but from the parable as a whole. There may be a *tertium comparationis*, but not *tertia* (i 70).

It will be obvious that these principles are not compatible either with the form in which the Parables have come down to us, or with what we are told about them in the Gospels. To a certain extent—not perhaps a very great, but yet an appreciable extent—they have to be rewritten. Where details are introduced which tend to complicate the issue, these are usually discarded as later interpolations. Perhaps this is done on the whole less often than might be expected.

But besides these minor changes there are two main points on which Jülicher deliberately throws over the tradition of the Gospels. These are: (1) all the cases in which by the side of the parable there is also given what purports to be its explanation; and (2) the account that is given of the object which our Lord had in speaking in parables.

The two instances in which our Lord is described as Himself explaining a parable after it has been told, both occur in the great collection of Parables in Matthew xiii. They are, of course, the Sower, and the Wheat and the Tares. The explanation of the Parable of the Sower is found in all three Gospels. The Wheat and the Tares, with its explanation, is peculiar to St. Matthew. Besides this, there is the express statement in St. Mark that 'privately to His disciples' our Lord expounded all His parabolic sayings (Mark iv 34). All these statements are necessarily rejected. They are set down to the Evangelists rather than to Jesus, as the product of a mistaken idea which had grown up that the Parables were difficult and enigmatical, 'mysteries of the kingdom' which needed a solution, dark sayings that could not be understood without the key.

It will also be remembered that in all three Gospels our Lord is represented as giving His own reason for the use of these dark sayings by applying to His hearers the words of the prophet Isaiah, 'This people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed,' &c.; as though it were His deliberate intention to conceal His meaning from the great majority of His hearers, and to reveal it only to the select few. According to Jülicher there was no intention to conceal at all, and nothing to conceal if there had been. The Parables were meant to be a help only and not a stumbling-block; and, rightly regarded, they were so clear that he who ran might read.

In Jülicher's view the paragraph on the object of teaching by parables was not an authentic record of words spoken by our Lord, but embodied the conclusions of the later Church drawn from the rejection of Christ by the Jews. The Jewish people had shown themselves blind and deaf. And this blindness and deafness had seemed to the disciples as in part penally inflicted. The nature of the teaching offered them was such as to leave them as they were. They *would* not hear, and therefore they *should* not hear. The Evangelists saw in that the sum of the whole matter. But the verdict was theirs and not their Master's.

This therefore is Jülicher's general conclusion: the sections containing interpretations of parables and all allusions to such interpretations go; the section which purports to give the object of this particular method of teaching goes; and all those side-touches which, if they were allowed to stand, would convert parable into allegory, also go. As Jülicher does not accept the Fourth Gospel as apostolic, the confessed allegories in that Gospel do not trouble him.

With these deductions the rest of the Parables, very much as they stand, are genuine words of Jesus. And Jülicher devotes a chapter, or practically two chapters, of his introductory volume (I, *Die Echtheit der Gleichnisreden Jesu*, and V, *Die Aufzeichnung der Gleichnisreden Jesu*) to the proof of their genuineness.

It will be seen that there is a logical unity and completeness about the whole theory; and it is put forward as the one theory that is scientifically tenable. Jülicher writes throughout with the force of conviction, and is perhaps rather dogmatic in tone. He certainly shows neither fear nor favour in his treatment of other writers on the subject, but he is generous in the recognition of what seems to him merit, from whatever quarter it may come.

All this is calculated to impress opinion; and I should not be at all surprised if the theory found a more or less general acceptance with those who claim to treat the New Testament on strictly scientific principles.

And yet I shall not hesitate to express my dissent from it. Logic is one thing, science is another. A science of which the subject-matter is life cannot always be logical. To call it logical often means that it pursues some one train of thought too much to the exclusion of others. The play and subtlety of living thought is apt to escape in the process. So it seems to me to be with Jülicher. He rides his one idea too hard. He is not really a pedantic writer, because he comes to his subject with a great deal of freshness, and sets down honestly what he sees. But I believe that the way in which he has worked out his idea is what might be called, not unfairly, pedantic. It is too *a priori*, and excludes more than it ought to exclude. Much of this exclusion seems to me to rest upon insufficient grounds.

I shall try to make good this position presently. But before attempting to argue the case, it will be more just and more satisfactory if I first give a few concrete examples of Jülicher's treatment of the Parables. Perhaps we shall learn something by the way. For whatever we may think of its main thesis, and whatever objections we may have to details—and there is one rather sweeping objection that I may mention before I have done—however all this may be, the book as a whole has many good qualities. It is the most considerable work on the Parables since Trench[1]—not forgetting Dr. A. B. Bruce—and in penetrative grasp and strength I believe that it surpasses both our English works.

I ought to say that Jülicher divides the Parables into four classes: (1) Similitudes (*Gleichnisse*) or Undeveloped Parables, in which one thing is simply compared with another; (2) Fables (called in vol. ii *Parabeln*) or Narrative Parables, in which the comparison is worked out in the form of a story; (3) Typical Stories (*Beispielerzählungen*), illustrating some principle or other by means of a concrete example; (4) Pure Allegories, which, as confined to the Fourth Gospel, are not further treated.

The number of the Parables may be very differently estimated, according as the dividing line is drawn between Parable and Similitude or Metaphor on the one hand and Allegory on the other. Steinmeyer put the number at 23 or 24, Göbel at 26 or 27, Trench at 30, Bruce at 33, with 8 'parable germs'; van Koetsveld, the Dutch pastor (*ob.* 1893), to whom Jülicher assigns the place of honour as a commentator on the Parables, would make the number 80 (or, more strictly, 79), though in his abridged *Hausbuch für die christliche Familie* this number is reduced to 35. One writer, von Wessenberg (Jülicher, i 28), rises to as many as 101. Jülicher himself fluctuates slightly in his estimate as well as in his classification; in his second volume he has treated in all 53, arranged thus:

---

[1] The English reader may be interested in Jülicher's estimate of our own leading writer. To his method, of course, he objects. In detail the work contains much that is excellent, in the way of grammatical and antiquarian notes, but too little sharp definition of ideas, too many dogmatical and edifying effusions, and no application of criticism (i 300).

A. Similitudes (*Gleichnisse*).

1. The Fig-tree as harbinger.
   Matt. xxiv 32 f.; Mark xiii 28 f.; Luke xxi 29–31.
2. The Slave bound to labour.
   Luke xvii 7–10.
3. The Children at play.
   Matt. xi 16–19; Luke vii 31–35.
4. The Son's Request.
   Matt. vii 9–11; Luke xi 11–13.
5. Disciple and Master.
   Matt. x 24 f.; Luke vi 40.
6. The Blind leading the Blind.
   Matt. xv 14; Luke vi 39.
7. Real Defilement.
   Mark vii 14–23; Matt. xv 10-20.
8. Salt.
   Matt. v 13; Mark ix 49 f.; Luke xiv 34 f.
9. The Lamp on the Stand.
   Mark iv 21; Matt. v 14[a], 15 f.; Luke viii 16, xi 33.
10. The City set on a Hill.
    Matt. v 14[b].
11. Revealing what is hidden.
    Mark iv 22; Matt. x 26 f.; Luke viii 17, xii 2 f.
12. The Eye as the Light of the Body.
    Matt. vi 22 f.; Luke xi 34–36.
13. Divided Service.
    Matt. vi 24; Luke xvi 13.
14. The Tree and its Fruits.
    Matt. vii 16–20, xii 33–37; Luke vi 43–46.
15. The instructed Scribe.
    Matt. xiii 52.
16. The Eagles and the Carcase.
    Matt. xxiv 28; Luke xvii 37.
17. The Thief.
    Matt. xxiv 43 f.; Luke xii 39 f.
18. The faithful and the unfaithful Steward.
    Matt. xxiv 45–51; Luke xii 42–48.
19. The Master's delayed Return.
    Luke xii 35–38; Mark xiii 33–37.
20. 'Physician, heal thyself.'
    Luke iv 23.
21. The Physician and the Sick.
    Mark ii 17; Matt. ix 12 f.; Luke v 31 f.
22. The Bridegroom.
    Mark ii 18–20; Matt. ix 14 f.; Luke v 33–35.

23. The old Garment, the old Bottles, the old Wine.
    Mark ii 21 f.; Matt. ix 16 f.; Luke v 36–39.
24. Tower-building and War-waging.
    Luke xiv 28 (25)–33.
25. The Beelzebub Similitudes.
    Mark iii 22–27; Matt. xii 22–30, 43–45; Luke xi 14–26.
26. On the Way to Judgement.
    Matt. v 25 f.; Luke xii 57–59.
27. Precedence at Feasts, and the right Kind of Guests.
    Luke xiv 7–11, 12–14.
28. Children and Dogs.
    Mark vii 27 f.; Matt. xv 26 f.

B. Parables (or Fables).

29. Building on the Rock and on Sand.
    Matt. vii 24–27; Luke vi 47–49.
30. The importunate Friend.
    Luke xi 5–8.
31. The Widow and the unjust Judge.
    Luke xviii 1–8.
32. The Creditor and the Two Debtors.
    Luke vii 36–50.
33. The unmerciful Servant.
    Matt. xviii 21–35.
34. The lost Sheep and the lost Piece of Silver.
    Matt. xviii 10–14; Luke xv 1–10.
35. The lost Son.
    Luke xv 11–32.
36. The Two Brothers.
    Matt. xxi 28–32; (Luke vii 29 f.).
37. The wicked Husbandmen.
    Mark xii 1–12; Matt. xxi 33–46; Luke xx 9–19.
38. The unwilling Guests.
    Matt. xxii 1–14; Luke xiv 15–24.
39. The barren Fig-tree.
    Luke xiii 6–9.
40. The Ten Virgins.
    Matt. xxv 1–13; (Luke xiii 23–30).
41. Like Pay for different Work.
    Matt. xx 1–16.
42. The lent Money.
    Matt. xxv 14–30; Luke xix 11–27.
43. The unrighteous Steward.
    Luke xvi 1–12.

44. The Four Kinds of Soil.
    Mark iv 3–9, 14–20; Matt. xiii 3–9, 18–23; Luke viii 5–8, 11–15.
45. The Seed growing of itself.
    Mark iv 26–29.
46. The Tares among the Wheat.
    Matt. xiii 24–30, 36–43.
47. The Draw-net.
    Matt. xiii 47–50.
48. The Mustard-seed and the Leaven.
    Mark iv 30–32; Matt. xiii 31–33; Luke xiii 18–21.
49. The Treasure and the Pearl.
    Matt. xiii 44–46.

C. Typical Stories (*Beispielerzählungen*).

50. The good Samaritan.
    Luke x 29–37.
51. The Pharisee and the Publican.
    Luke xviii 9–14.
52. The rich Fool.
    Luke xii 16–21.
53. Dives and Lazarus.
    Luke xvi 19–31.

The first question that we naturally ask of one who gives up the interpretations in the Gospels is what he will say of the Parable of the Sower. This is Jülicher's account of it:

'The Parable of the Sower was certainly meant by a concrete case from rural life to illustrate the law, that no labour and no expenditure of strength or means can everywhere count on the same success, the same blessing, the same acceptance; that while much is always done in vain, there is also much that has its fruit and its reward. This law also holds good for the Kingdom of Heaven: the Gospel need take no shame to itself that it constantly falls on deaf ears, and meets with but partial assent, uncertain love; enough if one way or another by the side of this some hearts surrender themselves to it for full fruition, for fulness of faith. Unreasonable pessimism and unreasonable optimism among the evangelists, the missionaries of the Kingdom, was what the Lord desired to check by the very telling effect of this story. . . . [As in the case of Jotham's parable] so also in this of the Sower, not too much is said about the Sower's failures: as they—as all failures, especially those of the missionaries of the Kingdom—are to be explained by very different causes, Jesus was obliged to seek some striking expression of this difference; and it is for that purpose, and not for the sake of poetic adornment, that He speaks of the three kinds of soil in which the seed will not grow, although He will not have supposed Himself to enumerate exactly in this way the various classes of human hearts that do not attain to fruit-bearing; these are indeed many more than three' (i 110 f.).

We will reserve our criticisms, and proceed to give a few more specimens of Jülicher's method.

The other parable with an interpretation is that of the Wheat and the Tares. This, as we have it, stands alone in the series. It is pure allegory. Only as such does it become intelligible, which as an incident it would not be. Not until we see that the householder is Christ, the servants His disciples, the enemy the Devil, and the reapers angels, the treatment of the wheat and tares that of the righteous and the wicked at the Last Judgement, does the story assume coherence and plausibility. These features are added by the Evangelist himself, who shows by the elaboration of his picture the pride that he took in his own composition. For the rest we cannot tell what was the form of the original parable, except so far as we can guess at this by comparing the Parable of the Draw-net, which in the document used at this point probably formed a pair with it, like the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, the Treasure and the Pearl. The Draw-net is thrown to the end for the sake of the impressive warning with which it concludes. As in that parable, so also in the genuine version of the Wheat and the Tares, there would be no place for an 'enemy'; it would be just a simple story of the two growths appearing side by side, the one at harvest-time collected for burning, the other gathered into the barn.

We are glad that Jülicher does not think it necessary to interfere with the figure of the Elder Brother in the Parable of the Lost Son. Here it is only a question of the stress that is laid on the salient point of the parable. This, as in the case of the other two parables in the same chapter, is really the rejoicing over the return of the penitent.

> 'So the Father does not dispute any of the contentions of his Elder Son, nor yet does he complain of misrepresentation or of his self-praise, or of his ungrateful suppression of kindnesses received; he does not even blame him expressly for feeling no joy at his brother's return.

Only himself, his own seemingly paradoxical and unfair behaviour, will he defend; and that by the telling juxtaposition of vv. 31 and 32: "While thou hast never been dead and lost to me, hast caused me no break in the even tenor of our domestic life, thy brother, by the surprise at his return to life and at his recovery after his clouded past, has indeed given me cause for unwonted joy; and so it is, the loudest jubilations are called forth, not by the happiness of uninterrupted possession, but by the restoration of that which has been lost."

'So the story ends: whether the Elder Son followed his Father into the banquet-hall, we are not told, any more than whether or for how long the friends and neighbours of vv. 6 and 9 complied with the invitation to join in the rejoicing (compare also xiii 9). The interest of the parable does not turn upon deciding how the Elder Son ended by behaving to the Younger, or whether the Younger was finally cured of his evil courses' (ii 358).

That seems to me to be fine and true criticism, which singles out a right note, and sustains it as it ought to be sustained.

It would be another thing to say that the figure of the Elder Brother was introduced only in order to give an opening for the Father's explanation. Jülicher does not in so many words give this as his opinion, but I imagine that he would imply it. I shall return to this point.

Another parable that is, on the whole, well treated is that of the Labourers in the Vineyard. The name that is given to this parable shows at once what is considered to be its main significance. It is headed 'Like Pay for different Work.' Jülicher here, as we might perhaps expect, cuts away the parable from the connexion which it has in the Gospel of St. Matthew, as an example of the 'last' becoming 'first', and the 'first' 'last.'

The equal payment is the one reward of the Christian—his final admission to the kingdom of heaven. It does not exclude the existence of different ranks and degrees in that kingdom, which is elsewhere taught quite clearly. What it does insist upon is the fact that in this reward there is an element of grace, something that has not been earned. As an act of grace it rests wholly with the goodwill of Him by whom it is given. The questions to which it might give rise are sufficiently answered by calling attention to this: 'Is thine eye evil because I am good?' On the one hand there is grace and goodness, but on the other hand there is also strict performance of what is promised. As Jülicher well puts it:

> 'The God who has but one common salvation for all the children of men, for chief priests and elders as well as for publicans and harlots, ought not to be blamed, as only a pitiful jealousy would dare to blame Him, but rather deserves thankful recognition, whether it be for the righteousness with which He keeps His promises to those who have kept His commandments, or for the goodness with which He rewards, far beyond merit or desert, those in whom the idleness of hours, of years, even of a whole life, called for censure or for punishment' (ii 467).

It is true that the text gives no hint as to any compensating difference in the quality of the work that is spread over a longer or a shorter time—either in the spirit in which it is done, or in the positive result attained. It is true also that we are intended to keep such considerations steadily out of sight. The main point of the parable in no way turns upon them. But I think that Jülicher goes a step too far when he lays down that the same common average of value is to be assumed throughout (p. 461 f.). I should prefer to put it that the question of value is not raised, that it does not enter into the parable. If the question were raised, then I think we may be sure that the difference of value would really come in. The teaching of the Gospels elsewhere certainly recognizes such compensating differences of value. The time that a man has been at work is only one part, and it may be a small part, of that which determines the estimate of his labour—

> 'In small proportions we just beauties see;
> And in short measures life may perfect be.'

And over and above the amount done, and its quality when laid in the scales, there must always be the spirit in which it is done. The woman who was a sinner received a warmer meed of praise than the self-satisfied Pharisee, and her love and gratitude were warmer. She who loved much was also greatly forgiven; but in the case of the Pharisee there was neither much love nor much forgiveness. There is a whole cycle of teaching to this effect to which this parable might also have been attached, if that had been its object.

I have said that Jülicher treats this parable without regard to the context in which it is found in the First Gospel. There it is placed between two repetitions of the saying that 'the last shall be first and the first last,' and the parable is clearly intended to illustrate that saying. And there is indeed an inversion of order in the way in which the labourers are called up to receive their pay. That however is, as Jülicher says, a very subordinate point in the parable. It is necessary to the parable because the murmurers who receive no more than their due must have had the opportunity of seeing the generous measure accorded to their predecessors. But the order of payment is a minor detail; and it might be thought, as Jülicher thinks, that it would be more likely to suggest the place assigned to the parable by the Evangelist than to establish an integral connexion with the saying about 'the first and the last.'

And yet, if we do not limit ourselves as Jülicher does, but take in the whole significance of the parable, including the reference, which is really after all not very remote, to the Pharisees as representing the first called, and the outcasts as representing those who are called last, then we shall allow that there is at least a more substantial reason for associating the parable with the saying.

A rather similar point arises in regard to another parable—that of the Unrighteous Steward. There, in the text as we have it, two lessons are drawn from the parable. One is the commendation of the steward 'because he had done wisely: for the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light.' The other is, 'Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.' Jülicher accepts the first of these, but rejects the second. He would make the lesson of the parable, to take betimes the appropriate means for attaining an end; he sees in it the case of one 'who rescues himself from a position to all appearance desperate by taking thought and acting while both thought and action can still be of use, while he has the means still in his hands' (ii 510 f.). For Jülicher the emphasis falls 'not on the right application of wealth, but on the resolute utilizing of the present as the condition of a happy future.'

On his principles a choice between the two lessons is necessary; and it is natural, and no doubt right, that he should choose the one that covers best the parable as a whole. But if we suppose that the Parables did admit more than a single lesson, and if we believe that our Lord did from time to time explain His own figurative language to His disciples, then it cannot be denied that the other lesson—to make such a use of wealth as to win for ourselves friends who will welcome us into the world to come—is in itself perfectly good and legitimate, a lesson which has a very distinct point, and is worth teaching.

Why should we be precluded from accepting it on grounds that seem to be so *a priori* as Prof. Jülicher's? The gist of the whole matter lies in a single sentence:

> 'To understand a parable,' we are told, 'we must not look for points of resemblance in the single constituent ideas of the parable, but we must note the resemblance between the *relation of the ideas* on the one side and that of those on the other. As the similitude is meant to illustrate a single word, *so is the parable meant to illustrate a single thought by means of an ὅμοιον, so that here too we can speak only of a* tertium comparationis, *not of several* tertia' (i 70).

Indeed a strange restriction! May we never group ideas, and compare not only the whole of a conception but the parts that make up the whole? Why should we not do this, if the parts really invite comparison? Why should we so cramp the free play of the human mind? Jülicher does not really observe his own rule. He says that the Parable of the Sower is meant to teach that no labour always succeeds, and that much of it is sure to be expended in vain, and yet he calls the parable *Vom viererlei Acker*, 'The Four Kinds of Soil.' What difference does it make that these four kinds do not exhaust all the possible kinds of soil? It would be sheer pedantry to expect that they should. Here, as elsewhere, we may well be content to have put before us a few striking and picturesque examples as specimens of the rest.

It would be a curious mind which permitted itself no side-glances. And such side-glances as we find in the Parables come in so easily, so simply, and so naturally, that it is doubly wrong to ignore them.

Again, to go back for a moment to the Elder Brother. The character and attitude of this Brother corresponds exactly to a permanent type, often hinted at in the Gospels and specially common at the time to which they belong. Are we to suppose that there is no allusion whatever to this type, and that he is only introduced as a lay figure to which to attach the Father's apology for his conduct?

I praised Jülicher's treatment of this incident, but I cannot be debarred from reading into it more significance than he does. The incident may help us to form our estimate of Jülicher's book as a whole. It brings out at once its strong and its weak side. I believe that on the whole its effect will be salutary. It is so important that the central ideas of the Parables should be treated as really central, and that the other subordinate ideas should be duly graduated in relation to them, that it is well, even at some cost, to have this side of the matter emphasized. But Jülicher, I feel sure, goes further than he need. He lays down a rule which is too rigid, and which violates the many-sidedness and varied interest of life.

Let us try to throw ourselves into the position of those Galilean peasants and fishermen, with a sprinkling of the more educated classes, who formed the audience of Jesus. Is it so incredible that the Parables needed explanation to them? It is hard for us to judge now that they have been so many centuries before the world, and we ourselves have been brought up from childhood upon them. We assume the Gospel of Jesus as a known quantity. We are familiar with the thoughts which He wished to elicit, the type of character which He wished to create. Strike away these conditions; suppose them non-existent; and put in their place the mental equipment of an ordinary Galilean crowd of the time. Where would the intelligence come in? What would it find to take hold of? The disciples themselves, even the chosen Twelve, are represented in the Gospels as very dull of apprehension—some would say preternaturally dull. But at least this representation seemed to have verisimilitude at the time. It was passed on from document to document, and became practically the accepted view of the second generation of Christians.

I am unable to see any adequate reason for doubting the tradition that has come down to us on any one of the three connected points to which Jülicher takes exception: that the hearers of Jesus did need some explanation of the teaching set before them, that as a matter of fact Jesus gave such explanation, and that the explanations were, generally speaking, of the kind of which specimens are given in the case of the Parables of the Sower, and of the Wheat and the Tares. The second of these two specimens is not quite so well attested as the first, and is perhaps open to a little more question; but if we accept the first, and accept also the statement of Mark iv 34, there can be no objection to it in principle.

And if we see our way to sustain the tradition as far as this, I believe that we shall also be prepared to sustain it further—to sustain it at least in the same general sense without absolutely pledging ourselves in detail. Jülicher, as we have seen, sets down to the account of the Evangelists the whole of the paragraph which professes to give the reason assigned by our Lord for speaking in parables. I have already referred to the fact, and it is important to remember, that this paragraph belongs to the fundamental document; so that in no case does the responsibility for it rest with the authors of our present Gospels. They simply copied what they found in the place where they found it. We will not say that the words were necessarily spoken on the occasion of the delivery of the first parable. Neither will I undertake to say that our Lord used exactly the form of words ascribed to Him and no other. Two out of the three Gospels make it the express object of the teaching by parables to confirm the hearers in their obstinacy and to hide the mysteries of the kingdom from them (*ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν κ. τ. λ.* Mark; *ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν κ. τ. λ.* Luke); Matthew puts this rather differently (*διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν*). It would seem as though *ἵνα βλέπωσιν* had been the form in the original document; it would not follow with stringency, that it was the form in which the words were actually spoken by Jesus. I should not like to say that they were not so spoken merely in order to ease the historical or dogmatic inference; but I also should not like to build too confidently upon the assumption that they were. All that I should have some confidence in extracting from the passage would be that our Lord probably did, at some time in the course of His ministry, apply or adapt, in reference to His own teaching, the words that were given as a special revelation describing the effect of his teaching to the prophet Isaiah.

Nor does there seem to be sufficient ground to reject the application to teaching by parables, though it is possible that the original reference may have been to the teaching of our Lord, or even to His ministry, as a whole. But the main point is that there is solid foundation for ascribing the words, or something like them, to our Lord. The Synoptical passage, Mark iv 10–12||, does not stand alone. In the Fourth Gospel where the ministry of our Lord is drawing to a close, and the Evangelist is looking back over its course, he too applies the prophecy of Isaiah as fulfilled in the unbelief of the Jews: 'For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and He hardened their heart, &c. These things said Isaiah, because he saw His glory; and he spake of Him' (John xii 39–41).

Then again when St. Paul arrives at Rome and receives a deputation from the Jewish colony there, he is represented as closing the debate by an appeal to the same prophecy: 'Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers, saying, Go thou unto this people, and say, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand,' &c. (Acts xxviii 25–27).

These indications go to show that the passage was one of the standing quotations current in the apostolic age as a summary verdict upon the refusal of the Jews to listen to the Gospel. We cannot of course infer for certain that its use was suggested by a similar use of the passage by our Lord Himself, but the probabilities seem to point that way. The facts would hang together very naturally and intelligibly if the first impulse came from Him.

And there is yet another observation that seems to me to point in the same direction. I refer to the places more particularly in St. John's Gospel, where our Lord speaks of His own preaching as of itself, by a sort of automatic process, dividing between believers and unbelievers, 'If any man hear My sayings and keep them not . . . the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day' (John xii 47, 48), and again, 'For judgement came I into this world, that they which see not may see, and that they which see may become blind' (John ix 39). It was but a working out of the prophecy of Simeon, 'Behold, this Child is set for the falling and rising up of many in Israel' (Luke ii 34). The whole ministry of Jesus had this effect; but we might regard it as culminating in the Parables. This simple and yet profound teaching left men either better or worse, according as it was apprehended and taken to heart. If it was not so taken at all, it did leave them worse—and that in proportion to the opportunities they had of really understanding it. That it should do so was not an act of special severity on the part of the Teacher. It was simply due to a law of Divine providence, which applies to all men and to all times, but to that generation in supreme degree, because its opportunities were the greatest.

This effect of His teaching our Lord foresaw, and I believe that it was in view of it that He appropriated words originally spoken of the life-work of a prophet in some degree like Himself.

My readers must judge how far Jülicher is justified in his final antithesis:

> 'One thing or the other (*Entweder-Oder*): *either* the aim to produce hardening levelled at the masses—that and nothing else—and with it the trustworthiness of the Synoptics in this matter too, *or* an erroneous inference on their part due to error in their premises and the same object that, as every one feels, parables elsewhere serve, including those of our Lord. This "one thing or the other" goes deep: *either* the Evangelists *or* Jesus' (i 148).

Perhaps it will now be understood what I meant when I began by taking Jülicher as a rather specially apt example of 'vigour and rigour.' The sentences just quoted are a good specimen of his style. The phrase *Entweder-Oder* is one that has attractions for him: he elsewhere speaks of Jesus Himself as 'the Man of the *Entweder-Oder*' (ii 456). For that there may be some ground: but, at least in the passage just quoted, it seems to me that the antithesis presented is too sharp, and the method too peremptory.

The most important aspect of Jülicher's book is no doubt his general view of the Parables, and of the principles of interpretation to be applied to them. But the book offers much more than this: the second volume is nothing less than a close critical and exegetical study of so much of the text of the Synoptic Gospels as comes under the head of Parable.

The author himself is aware that there may be two opinions as to the policy of this elaborate treatment. I do not doubt that the book would be more effective if it had been not more than a third of the length—just a broad summarizing treatment of each parable, with salient points brought into relief, but otherwise not going much into detail. This is the kind of book which an English writer would have aimed at; and I believe that Herr Jülicher might do well to consider whether he would not even now find it worth while to sit down and rewrite the whole on this much condensed scale. Being a German, he is not likely to be weary of his self-imposed task; and after his laborious study of the details of his subject, he would now have it so thoroughly in hand that the book would be sure to come out a far more rounded and artistic whole. An artistic whole it cannot be called at present; and some self-repression would be needed to make it one. But in rewriting from the full mind the process of sifting, grouping, and shaping would come naturally of itself.

It is not only that by taking this course I believe that the author would be doing the best for his own reputation in years to come—he might produce a classic in its way for which a long life was assured—but besides this he would, I imagine, reap a far more substantial harvest than the present two volumes are likely to bring him. A good translation of such a work as I have suggested would, I believe, have a large and steady sale in Great Britain and America.

It is an instance of German thoroughness that the author has made his book what it is; and it would be ungracious not to acknowledge the abundant material that he has laid before us. The mere fact of collecting and setting down all this material must needs be of great value to the author; and for the student and scholar no abridgement can supersede it. It is one commentary the more on a large section of that part of the New Testament which at the present moment most needs commentaries, the Synoptic Gospels.

What exactly are we to say as to the objective value of this commentary as it stands? Herr Jülicher is, as I have said more than once, an undoubtedly able man; and a commentary by such a man, which represents many years of study, cannot fail to deserve attention. But I have my doubts as to whether it is quite the work of a heaven-sent exegete.

Here again I should take exception to the form. As compared with the old-fashioned *Scholia*, a sort of running commentary is at the present time far more fashionable. But I much suspect that the fashion is a mistake. It is rare indeed for the running commentary to be really readable; and if it is not readable, what is gained? It is apt to be far more prolix than the *Scholion*, and it is far more difficult to find one's way about in it. Terseness and clear printing, with the reference figures well thrown out, are essential to the *Scholion*. And the pressure that is thus put upon writer and printer is all to their own advantage. Bengel's *Gnomon* still remains the best model of style[1].

In Jülicher's commentary, as in all commentaries, there is much with which one agrees, and much from which one dissents; and he would be a conceited critic who took the measure of his own agreement or dissent as a sufficient index of value. But I have expressed my doubts as to the extent to which Herr Jülicher will carry his readers irresistibly with him. As to one whole class of annotations these doubts rise to a considerable degree of scepticism. I refer especially to the treatment of the text.

It may seem strange to say it of one who (in his *Einleitung*) has written in such a generally competent manner about the text, and who has applied to that part of his subject so much thought as Professor Jülicher; but I cannot dismiss from my mind the impression that in spite of these qualifications he handles questions of text like an *amateur*. I mean by this that he takes each reading as if it stood alone, and needed little for its determination besides the relation which the reading bears to the context. Jülicher speaks of 'better MSS' and 'inferior MSS,' and of this or that family of witnesses, but these distinctions appear to have a *minimum* of significance for him. He is prepared to throw them over without compunction at the bidding of internal indications, and especially in deference to what he thinks is required by the context. He seems to forget how very double-edged such indications constantly are. The decisive considerations for Herr Jülicher are often just what we might conceive to have been at work in the mind of the scribe who had the best attested reading before him, but felt bound to alter and 'improve' it. Herr Jülicher's, I imagine, is often just an 'emended text'—a text emended, not as usually happens by an ancient scribe, but by a modern editor.

---

[1] Blass on the Acts is also a good recent example; and the Cambridge commentaries (Lightfoot, Hort, Westcott, Swete) are essentially of the same type; they are still 'notes' though very full 'notes.'

I therefore, upon the whole, do not regard Herr Jülicher's commentary as by any means ideal. Still it is, as I once more repeat, an able piece of work, and one that the exegete cannot afford to neglect. Even when it does not command his assent, it will constantly suggest interesting points of view.

W. SANDAY.

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS.

CHRONOLOGY is the indispensable groundwork of history, and it is natural therefore that the great Berlin edition of the ante-Nicene writers now in progress should be preceded not only by Professor Harnack's monumental work on the history and transmission of the literature of the first three centuries, but also by the same writer's companion work on its chronology[1]. For such a general work, both the accessions of new material and the multiplication of special studies on points of detail, which have marked the generation now elapsed, offered a special opportunity, and Professor Harnack has not been slow to seize it. It is no part of my intention to make any detailed estimate of the success of his venture over ground that any one less encyclopaedic than himself could hardly have covered[2]. His book, if it has defects, has also signal merits, chief among them being his resolute determination to take nothing for granted, but to subject every point to a fresh and rigorous examination. In any case, its appearance marks the importance which the leading scholars of the day attach to chronological inquiries, and may serve as some sort of justification for the particular attention which I desire to draw to one corner of the chronological field, namely, the episcopal lists of the great churches and their historical trustworthiness. The subject is indeed so nearly related to the *origines* of episcopacy itself that it may well make a more than ordinary claim on the time and research of historical and theological students.

---

[1] *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius: Erster Theil, Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand*, 2 voll. Leipzig, 1893; *Zweiter Theil, Die Chronologie*, vol. i, *Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenäus nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen*, Leipzig, 1897.

[2] One or two remarks may be hazarded on points unconnected with the special topic of this article. (1) With regard to Harnack's chronology of the apostolic age, I have already expressed elsewhere (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i 415–425, especially 418, 419) the opinion that his revolt from what may be called the received chronology—that of Wieseler, followed for instance throughout by Lightfoot—though justifiable up to a certain point, is carried too far. (2) In discussing at length the chronology of St. Polycarp's martyrdom, pp. 334–356, he calls attention to new researches into the connected topic of the writings of the *rhetor* Aristides, and after some beating about the bush, comes back to Waddington and Lightfoot's year, 155 A. D.; he does not, however, mention the objection (as I think the fatal objection) raised by Dr. Salmon (*Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv 430) to that year, or the solution offered by myself in *Studia Biblica*, ii 105–155 (Oxford, 1890), which made the year 156 possible. (3) With regard to the important date of Justin Martyr's two Apologies, the discovery that the date of office of L. Munatius Felix, probably the procurator of Egypt mentioned in *Apol.* i 29, falls between A. D. 148 and 154 (announced by F. G. Kenyon in the *Academy* for Feb. 1, 1896: see now *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, ii 171 [A. D. 1898], No. ccclviii: from the new volume of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* [part II, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, A. D. 1899], No. ccxxxvii, col. 8, ll. 18, 20, we further learn that he was in office on

Forty or fifty years ago it would have seemed a rash undertaking to compass in any form or to any degree the rehabilitation of these lists. The controversy raged round the main documents of Christianity, and evidence so indirect and secondary as the traditions of the churches about their early rulers would have been refused a hearing as the interested inventions of ecclesiastics in search of support for their pretensions. It would be unjust not to emphasize the enormous value of Baur's works in calling (or rather recalling) into view the truth, forgotten for many centuries, that New Testament documents cannot historically be isolated from other documents of primitive Christianity, that both must be studied as other historical documents are studied, and differences and developments fairly recognized. But Baur himself with all the energy of a new discoverer applied his principle in a fashion which admitted only five books of the New Testament, and very little else from the first century of the Church, as genuine productions of the authors whose names they bear. Nothing shows better how far we have moved in a constructive direction since Baur than the preface to this very work of Harnack's on chronology: the following sentences from it have been quoted often enough in the last two years, but they will bear quoting again:

> 'There was a period—the public at large is still living in it—when people thought they had no choice but to look on the earliest Christian documents, those of the New Testament included, as a tissue of decep-

---

Sept. 13, A.D. 151) gives a *terminus a quo* for the *Apology* which agrees fairly with Harnack's dating (A.D. 152–153), but appears to be unknown to him.

tions and falsifications. That period is now past and gone. For science it was only an episode, in which indeed it learnt much, but at the end of which it must forget much. But the results of the following inquiries go in a "reactionary" direction, even beyond what might be termed the average position of contemporary criticism. The primitive literature of the Church as a whole and most of the individual parts of it are, from the standpoint of literary history, trustworthy and authentic. In all the New Testament there is probably only a single writing which quite strictly deserves the epithet "pseudonymous," the Second Epistle of Peter: and apart from Gnostic forgeries the whole number of pseudonymous ecclesiastical writings as far as the age of Irenaeus is small and easily enumerated. . . . Even the number of documents which suffered interpolation in the second century, like the Pastoral Epistles, is very trifling, while some of the interpolations are as harmless as those made in our hymn-books and catechisms.'

In the comprehensive volume which follows this preface and forms the justification for its statement, the 200 pages of 'introductory studies' deal for the most part with the same subject as this article. For the Roman Church, Harnack starts from the results obtained by the researches of Mommsen, Lipsius, Duchesne, and above all, Lightfoot.[1] But he has this advantage over all his predecessors, at least in respect to the treatment of our primary authority, the historian Eusebius of Caesarea, that the evidence is considered throughout as a whole: the *Chronicle* and the *History* of Eusebius are brought into close relation with one another, and the episcopal lists of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are taken into account equally with the Roman. I shall have occasion from time to time to express dissent from Harnack's conclusions: it is only right therefore to take this opportunity of stating my general indebtedness to his method.

The present paper deals with the preliminary questions necessary to the appreciation of the evidence of Eusebius, especially of his *Chronicle*; the next will treat of the episcopal lists themselves, in the order Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome.

---

[1] Th. Mommsen, *Ueber den Chronographen von J.* 354 (A. D. 1850), R. A. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe* (1869), Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* (1886), J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, ed. 2 (1886), &c. For fuller bibliographies of the many important works devoted to the episcopal lists by recent critics see Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 201, Harnack, p. 70.

I. *Eusebius of Caesarae and his 'Chronicle.'*

The *Chronicle*—for the present purpose the more important of Eusebius' two great historical works—is preserved entire in Armenian and in Latin, partially in two Syriac epitomes, and in numerous, for the most part unacknowledged, quotations in Byzantine writers such as George Syncellus. The chronological framework which binds the whole together, from its commencement at the dawn of history to its close at the *Vicennalia* of Constantine, is supplied by years counted from Abraham: but with the Abrahamic years are co-ordinated such other methods of reckoning as are from time to time applicable—for the Christian centuries these are the Olympiads and the years of the emperors—and it is to them that we must turn in order to translate Eusebius' notices into a reckoning intelligible to ourselves. This preliminary inquiry into the method of Eusebius, out of which grows the further question to what extent he borrowed his method from older chronographers, is almost as necessary a prelude to the effective study of the episcopal lists as the sister problem of the relative value for the text of the Armenian and Latin versions.

1. Is the Armenian or the Latin version the more trustworthy?

That St. Jerome, to whom we owe the Latin version, was something else than a mere translator, was clear enough; he amplified the notices relating to the West, and continued the *Chronicle* down to 378 A. D., fifty years beyond the point where Eusebius stopped. So it was perhaps not unnatural that the scholars who first had to face the question of relative value pinned their faith almost exclusively on the Armenian. Truer views were enforced by Hort and Lightfoot, although neither they nor Harnack, who on this head admits himself a complete convert[1], have fully realized the inferiority of this version at almost every point. Three crucial instances may be given: in the first Hort and Lightfoot saw the truth, and are now followed by Harnack; the second has not before been fully treated; as regards the third, Lightfoot and Harnack still take the wrong side.

(i) The Armenian version differs from Jerome and the *History* by several years—generally four—in its dates of the popes; its supporters therefore—Lipsius, von Gutschmid, and formerly Harnack—were forced to hold, not only that Eusebius in the interval between writing the *Chronicle* and the *History* had altered his views or bettered his information about the papal chronology (this would be possible enough), but that Jerome had substituted this revised chronology in his version of the *Chronicle*, and further, that the Syriac translator—for the Syriac epitomes too agree with Jerome and the *Chronicle*—had independently done exactly the same thing, an almost impossible combination[1]. On the other hand, the acceptance of the Latin and Syriac as evidence for the true text of the *Chronicle* carries with it this important simplification of the problems of Eusebian criticism, that Eusebius is not to be supposed, except in very rare cases[2], to make one statement in his *Chronicle* and another in his *History*.

---

[1] *Chronologie*, p. 52, n. 1, p. 113.

(ii) The Armenian differs from Jerome by one year throughout in its synchronisms of the Olympiads; thus Tiberius 1 = Ann. Abr. 2030 (in both versions) = Ol. 198.2 in Jerome, Ol. 198.3 in the Armenian. Here the doubt is solved in favour of Jerome by two other synchronisms found in Eusebius between Olympiad years and years of Tiberius. In the first case Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* equates Tiberius 15, the starting-point of our Lord's ministry, with Ol. 201.4[3]; in the second case he appeals in the *Chronicle* (both Armenian and Jerome) to the great eclipse recorded by Phlegon under Ol. 202.4 and identifies it with the darkness of the Crucifixion, and since he certainly placed the Crucifixion in Tiberius 19[4], he must have equated Tib. 19 with Ol. 202.4. Both these equations, Ol. 201.4 = Tib. 15, Ol. 202.4 = Tib. 19, agree with Jerome's reckoning, and disagree with the Armenian.

(iii) The Armenian and Jerome differ again in a series of notices which Jerome assigns (like all other notices) to a particular year, but which the Armenian places exceptionally, not opposite any particular year, but between two years. In these cases both Lightfoot and Harnack assume the correctness of the Armenian: and both build important conclusions on the assumption. Thus Lightfoot, from the fact that the martyrdoms of Ignatius (Trajan 10 in Jerome) and Polycarp (M. Aurelius 7 in Jerome) are recorded in the Armenian not opposite any special year, but between Trajan 8, 9 and M. Aurelius 6, 7 respectively, concludes that Eusebius intended to express ignorance of the exact dates of these martyrdoms. Harnack goes further and draws two sweeping deductions as to this class of notices: the first, that Eusebius found these notices in the source of his *Chronicle* in a separate column, attached to the reign of a particular emperor, but not to any particular year in it[1]; the second—perhaps not strictly consistent with the first—that as Eusebius in these instances avoids a date and so admits his ignorance, in all other notices he had, or believed he had, definite reasons for the particular year specified. This theory fails to explain why events which are dated specifically in the *Chronicle* are dated quite vaguely in the *History*: e. g. Basilides is in the *Chronicle* under Hadrian 17, in the *History* undated: Justin Martyr in the one under Pius 4, in the other undated: the Jerusalem bishops from Symeon to Narcissus are in five groups assigned to five specific years in the *Chronicle*, in two groups only in the *History*. A different, much simpler, and as I still believe much truer explanation was given by me some years ago in the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review*[2]. It is in general the more bulky notices—as any one can see by looking at Schoene's edition—which are not compressed into the column properly reserved for them: they are written right across the page, and the motive appears to be mere economy of space. The device may even be as modern as the scribe of the thirteenth-century MS at Etchmiadzin, which is said to be the archetype of all known MSS of the Armenian version[3]. Harnack's volume marks a great step in advance in the criticism of the *Chronicle*: but this unfortunate superstition about the undated notices in the Armenian haunts his reasoning at every turn. He himself uses of another chronicle, the *Paschal Chronicle*, the pregnant argument that for every event chronicled some date or other must be given, *es brauchte ein bestimmtes Jahr* (p. 347 n.). There is no ground whatever for supposing that Eusebius was an exception to the general rule of chroniclers in this respect, or that the Armenian represents him more correctly than Jerome even in a single class of cases.

---

[1] See further on this Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, ed. 2, pp. 222–232.

[2] In the *Chronicle* the date of Musanus is given as Severus 11 = Ann. Abr. 2220, in the *History* as under M. Aurelius (*H. E.* iv 21, 28); in the *Chronicle* the martyrdoms at Lyons are dated Ann. Abr. 2183 = M. Aurelius 7, in the *History* in M. Aurelius 17 (*H. E.* v pref.).

[3] Τιβερίου δὲ τὸ πεντεκαιδέκατον τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας κατὰ τὸ δ′ τῆς σα′ Ὀλυμπιάδος συμπίπτει. *Praep. Ev.* X ix 1.

[4] See my article *Chronology of the New Testament* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i 413 *a*; and with regard to the Olympiads *ib.* 418.

---

[1] *Chronologie*, pp. 55 n. 1, 57 n. 1. As we shall see, he supposes Eusebius to make systematic use of this grouping by emperors in the *History*.

[2] October, 1892, *Early Chronicles of the Western Church*, p. 121.

[3] This was shown by Mommsen in Hermes, 1895, p. 321 ff. (Harnack, p. 113).

Our first question then is answered. The result to which the most recent investigators have been feeling their way has proved itself more universally true than perhaps any of them had yet seen. For the true text and chronology of Eusebius we turn in the first place to St. Jerome[1].

2. The chronological framework of the *Chronicle*.

Having thus settled the basis of the text of Eusebius, we pass to the second subject of preliminary inquiry, and ask, What are the mutual relations of his Abrahamic years, his Olympiad years, and his regnal years of emperors?

(i) The years of Abraham, if not a device first invented by Eusebius himself, are in any case employed by him first among extant chronological writers, and can therefore supply no external standard for testing the system of chronology used.

(ii) The Olympiads on the other hand have a known starting-point from July, B.C. 776, and so from the synchronisms with them we ought to be able to fix the precise meaning of each year of Abraham. Harnack however asserts, though without giving any reasons, that Eusebius' Olympiad years are wrongly reckoned by two years in the Armenian and by one even in Jerome (p. 115): on which statement the obvious comment is that if the Eusebian

---

[1] Of course it is not meant that Jerome made no alterations—he certainly changed Eusebius' date for the Passion from Tib. 19 to Tib. 18, because, from the common starting-point in Tib. 15, he only reckoned three years for the ministry against Eusebius' four—but only that his alterations are few in the Christian notices and easily recognisable.

Unfortunately, as Harnack reminds us (p. 115), there is still no satisfactory edition of Jerome's version; none of them, for instance, down to the latest—that of Schoene in 1866—took any account of the Bodleian MS, which appears to be the oldest of all extant MSS.

Abrahamic year began on January 1 (as Harnack seems to assume)[1], the synchronism with the Olympiad year, which began in July, must be either six months or eighteen months out—it cannot be exactly right, and it cannot be exactly twelve months or two years wrong. Now in the first place, there seems no possible reason for supposing that Eusebius would or did reckon from January 1: all analogy would suggest some point in the early autumn. No doubt the Roman year began on January 1: but Eusebius was an Eastern and not a Roman, and in the East the year almost universally commenced about September.

> 'The Jewish civil year began in September: the old Attic lunar year in July: the old Macedonian lunar year in October: the calendars of Asia Minor in imperial times used the Macedonian months made into a solar year commencing September 23: the similar calendar of Syria used the same months in the same way, only that each month was pushed down one place, so that the year presumably began at the end of October: the Alexandrian year began on August 29: the era of Alexander or the Greeks was reckoned from September, B.C. 312: the Indictions, an invention of Eusebius' own day, were counted certainly from September, probably from September, A.D. 312[1].'

If Eusebius then followed the general practice of his countrymen, his year and the Olympiad year would begin at points not far removed from one another; which indeed is what we should expect, seeing that he uses the Olympiads, year by year, as parallel with his own years of Abraham. It may no doubt be asserted that by an error of Eusebius the parallelism between the two was just a year wrong: but what evidence is there in support of an assertion so improbable?

(iii) What has perhaps misled Harnack here is a hasty comparison of the Olympiad with the imperial regnal years. He would find for instance that, whereas Claudius began to reign in January, A.D. 41, and Nero in October, A.D. 54, in the *Chronicle* Claudius 1 = Ol. 205.1 = July 41–July 42 and Nero 1

---

[1] Harnack is probably following von Gutschmid, *De temporum notis quibus Eusebius utitur*, p. 8 ff. This writer, it may be here remarked, was a thorough-going believer in the Armenian: and his work is in consequence antiquated to a large extent.

[2] I repeat these sentences from my article on New Testament Chronology in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i 418; and add that the Antiochene year began on Oct. 1.

=Ol. 208.3=July 55–July 56: and it might not unnaturally be concluded that the Olympiads were a year wrong. But it is not so much Eusebius who is wrongly reckoning his Olympiads, as those moderns who have forgotten to ask how Eusebius was reckoning his regnal years. Thus Harnack assumes (*Chronologie*, p. 234) that as Nero came to the throne in October, 54 A.D., Nero 2 in the *Chronicle* must mean October 55–October 56, though it is in the last degree unlikely that a chronicle where the years, reckoned continuously from Abraham and from the Olympiads, run of course from fixed starting-points, should admit in the parallel column a reckoning of regnal years that was perpetually changing, as would be the case if each emperor began his first year on the day of his accession and his succeeding years on its anniversaries. If Trajan, whose reign is (correctly) given as xix years vi months, is allowed only 19 regnal years (Ann. Abr. 2114–2132), while Domitian, whose reign is given as xv years v months, is allowed 16 (Ann. Abr. 2097–2112), it seems clear that (as was to be expected) the imperial years are brought into definite and fixed relation with the continuous reckoning. In other words, each regnal year must have begun at the same point as the Abrahamic year, that is, about September[1]: and the only question is whether the first year of each emperor was reckoned to begin in the September *before* or the September *after* his accession—i.e. whether Claudius 1 began in September 40 or September 41, Nero 1 in September 54 or September 55. If the former, then the synchronism with the Olympiads is, as Harnack says, wrong by one year: if the latter, the synchronism is correct, for in the *Chronicle*, as we have just seen, Claudius 1=Ol. 205.1=July 41–July 42, Nero 1=Ol. 208.3=July 55–July 56.

The conclusion that Eusebius commences the regnal year of each emperor in the September following his accession, and that the synchronisms of regnal and Olympiad years are approximately correct, is not a mere hypothesis; for it admits of at least partial verification, as the following table will show. The first and second columns give the actual dates—the first the duration of each reign, the second the number of Septembers (in other words, of years reckoned from September) in it; the third and fourth columns give the data of Jerome's version—the third the summary of the duration of the reign which accompanies each emperor's name, the fourth the number of years of Abraham or Olympiad years allotted to the reign. I have borrowed the dates from Goyau's convenient *Chronologie de l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1891).

---

[1] Von Gutschmid (*op. cit.*) agrees, I find, with the view here maintained that the regnal years of the earlier emperors are reckoned from the autumn—he supposes, perhaps rightly, from October 1, the new year day of the Antiochene era. But he holds that Eusebius' Abrahamic year was Julian, and began on the January preceding, so that the regnal years would differ by nine months!

	Column 1					*Col.* 2	*Column* 3	*Col.*
	A.D.	A.D.	Y.	M.	D.			
1. Tiberius	14 Aug. 19—	37 Mar. 16	(22	6	25)	23	XXIII	23
2. Gaius	37 Mar. 16—	41 Jan. 24	(3	10	8)	4	III X	4
3. Claudius	41 Jan. 24—	54 Oct. 13	(13	8	19)	14	XIII VIII XXIX	14
4. Nero	54 Oct. 13—	68 June 9	(13	7	27)	14	XIII VII XXVIII	14[1]
Ephemeral emperors	68 June 9—	69 July 1	(1	0	22)			
5. Vespasian	69 July 1—	79 June 23	(9	11	22)	10	IX XI XXII	10
6. Titus	79 June 23—	81 Sept. 13	(2	2	21)	2[2]	II II	2
7. Domitian	81 Sept. 13—	96 Sept. 18	(15	0	5)	16[3]	XV V	16
8. Nerva	96 Sept. 18—	98 Jan. 25	(1	4	7)	1[4]	I IV	1
9. Trajan	98 Jan. 25—	117 Aug. 9	(19	6	15)	19	XIX VI	19
10. Hadrian	117 Aug. 9—	138 July 10	(20	11	1)	21	XXI	21
11. Ant. Pius	138 July 10—	161 Mar. 7	(22	8	25)	23	XXII VI[5]	23
12. M. Aurelius	161 Mar. 7—	180 Mar. 17	(19	0	10)	19	XIX I	19
13. Commodus	180 Mar. 17—	193 Jan. 1	(12	9	15)	13	XIII	13

[1] Of the interregnum between Nero and Vespasian, which lasted just a year, nothing is said, nor are the ephemeral rulers, Galba, Otho, or Vitellius, reckoned in the series of emperors; but as they are mentioned under Nero 14 it is probable that that year is meant to extend as far as Vespasian's accession, and I have reckoned accordingly: see also p. 191 n. 8. The Bodleian MS, however, marks a year 1—presumably Vespasian's—opposite the notice of Galba's death: and if Vespasian was looked upon as Galba's legitimate successor, this arrangement may possibly be the original one. The notice of Vespasian's accession comes (as in Schoene's edition) at a later stage: in the MS it is marked—just as in Severus' case, see p. 191 n. 2—as year 2.

[2] As the figures stand, if Titus is to have only two years, the commencement of a new year's reckoning must fall after Sept. 13: see also next note.

[3] As a matter of fact Domitian reigned only fifteen years and five days; and as sixteen years (Ann. Abr. 2097–2112) are assigned him, the commencement of the new year reckoning ought strictly to fall between September 13 (see last note) and 18. But as Eusebius has made the fifteen years five days into fifteen years five months, he must have either antedated his accession or postdated his death.

[4] Again, if Nerva is to have only one year, the new year reckoning must not commence after September 18.

[5] I have corrected Jerome's three months into six (m. III into m. VI) in accordance with the Armenian, which is nearer the facts (8 m. 25 d.).

	Column 1					Col. 2	Column 3	Col. 4
	A. D.	A. D.	Y.	M.	D.			
14. Pertinax	193 Jan. 1	—193 Mar. 28	(0	2	27)	—	m. vi	18[2]
15. Sept. Severus	193 [Mar.28][1]	—211 Feb. 4	(17	10	7)	18	xviii	
16. Caracalla	211 Feb. 4	—217 Apr. 8	(6	2	4)	6	vii[3]	7[3]
17. Macrinus	217 Apr. 8	—218 [Apr.16][4]	(1	0	8)	1	i	1
18. Elagabalus	218 Apr. 16[4]	—222 Mar. 11	(3	10	23)	4	iv	4
19. Alex. Severus	222 Mar. 11	—235 Mar. 18	(13	0	7)	13	xiii	13
20. Maximin	235 Mar. 18	—238 [Mar.16][5]	(2	11	26)	3	iii	3
21. Gordian	238 [Mar.16][5]	—244 *c.* Mar. 1	(*c.* 5	11	13)	6	vi	6
22. Philip	244 *c.* Mar. 1	—249 *c.* Oct. 1	(*c.* 5	7	0)	6	vii[6]	7[6]
23. Decius	249 *c.* Oct. 1	—251 summer	(*c.* 1	9	0)	1	i iii[7]	1
24. Gallus Volusianus	251 summer	—253 May	(*c.* 1	10	0)	2	ii iv[7]	2
25. Valerian Gallienus	253 May	—268 Mar. 4	(*c.* 14	10	0)	15	xv	15
26. Claudius	268 Mar.	—270 Apr.	(*c.* 2	1	0)	2	i ix	2
27. Aurelian	270 May	—275 [Sept.][8]	(*c.* 5	4	0)	6[9]	v vi	5
28. Tacitus	275 Sept. 25	—276 Apr.	(*c.* 0	7	0)		m. vi	1
29. Probus	276 Apr.	—282 Oct.	(*c.* 6	6	0)	7	vi iv	6[10]
30. Carus Carinus Numerian	282 Oct.	—284 [Sept.17]	(*c.* 1	11	0)[11]	2	ii	2
31. Diocletian	284 Sept. 17	—305 Mar.	(*c.* 20	6	0)	20	xx	20

---

[1] I reckon Severus from the date of the death of Pertinax, whose representative he claimed to be.

[2] The Armenian gives Pertinax one year and Severus eighteen, thus getting a year out of accord with Jerome, who (no doubt rightly) gives eighteen to the two together—Pertinax still has one, but Severus begins with year 2.

[3] The cypher for the regnal years (and the number of years of Abraham), which has been strictly correct hitherto on the assumption of a new year's day about Sept. 15, is wrong for the first time with Caracalla: seven should be six. See below, note 6.

[4] I reckon Macrinus' reign not down to his death, but to the proclamation of his successor: see next note.

[5] As in the last case I reckon Maximin only down to the proclamation of the Gordians, who were at once recognized in Rome.

[6] As with Caracalla, so with Philip, the *Chronicle* gives one year too many: seven for six. Except with a new year day between March and October not even six could be reached.

[7] The reign of Decius is too short by just as much as that of Gallus and Volusianus is too long. Perhaps Eusebius dated the death of the Decii six months too early.

[8] The interregnum between Aurelian, who died in January, and Tacitus, who consented to reign in September, seems to be reckoned to the former: cf. p. 190 n. 1.

[9] The sixth new year day appears to belong properly to Aurelian rather than to Tacitus; and Aurelian actually has six years (and Tacitus none) in the Armenian: see next note.

[10] Probus ought strictly to have seven years (with the Armenian) rather than six (with Jerome). But we have seen that both Caracalla and Philip (notes 3 and 6 above) have a year too many, and it is safest therefore to suppose that Eusebius is getting back towards a correct calculation by giving Probus a year too few.

[11] As for Macrinus and Maximin, so here the reign is probably held to end

On a comparison of the actual chronology in columns 1 and 2 of this list with Eusebius' representation of it in columns 3 and 4, two points at once arrest attention. (1) The number of years of Abraham allotted to each reign (col. 4) shows itself to be in absolute accord with the facts (col. 2) from Tiberius to Septimius Severus inclusive; in the third century, on the other hand, the agreement is marred by three mistakes—the addition of a year each to Caracalla and Philip, and the loss of a year to Probus. (2) Similarly, the duration expressly assigned to each reign (col. 3) attains almost minute exactness (compare col. 1) from Gaius down to M. Aurelius[1]; conversely again for the later reigns years only as a rule are assigned, or if months as well as years, the months are generally wrong.

No doubt the third century with the multiplication of ephemeral emperors offered a chronographer more chances of going wrong than the first or second; yet even taking that into account, the contrast is marked enough to suggest a possibility which there has so far been no occasion to consider, but which must be borne in mind at every stage of the criticism of literature such as this—the possibility, namely, that sources different in origin and value lie behind different parts of the *Chronicle*. It may, indeed, be assumed that for events and dates that belonged to his own times Eusebius was his own authority; it may be assumed too that a scholar of his prodigious erudition must have amassed from his own reading many items of information for every period and generation, ancient or modern; but it has yet to be asked what predecessors he had had in the series of Christian chroniclers, and whether, and to what extent, he borrowed his material or his system from them.

3. Eusebius and the Christian chroniclers before him.

(i) Of unknown date is the chronographer Bruttius, quoted once by Eusebius (*Chronicle*, Domitian 16), and three times by the sixth-century chronographer, Malalas. There is nothing to show that either quotes him first-hand, and it is probable that Julius Africanus (see No. vi) was the intermediary through

---

with the new emperor's claim to the throne, September, A. D. 284, not with his predecessor's death: Carinus was reigning in the West till March, A. D. 285.

[1] The apparent exception in Domitian's case admits of easy explanation: see p. 190 n. 3.

whom both Eusebius and Malalas derived their notices. If so, Bruttius must have written between the times of Domitian and of Africanus, somewhere in the second century; and this seems to be just the time when the family of the Bruttii was at the height of its importance in Rome. A comparison of the parallel passage in the *History* (iii 18) seems to prove that Eusebius reckoned Bruttius for a heathen; but Lightfoot (*S. Clement*, i 48) gives reasons for thinking him really a Christian. If Eusebius was mistaken in a point of such capital importance, it would be certain (what is in any case probable) that Bruttius was not one of his direct authorities.

(ii) The *Exegetica* of Julius Cassianus are quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i 21 101) as fixing the date of Moses. Eusebius in his *History* (vi 13 § 7) has noted Clement's reference; but as he appears to know nothing else whatever about Cassianus, he cannot have used him as one of his authorities in the *Chronicle*.

(iii) Judas, a Jewish Christian (as would appear from his name), published a system of chronology which brought the close of Daniel's seventy weeks to the tenth year of Severus, A. D. 202. Eusebius, to whom indeed we owe this information (*H. E.* vi 7), had apparently had the work in his hands; but we should gather from his brief description that the author was one of that class of apocalyptic writers whom he held in special detestation, and it is therefore improbable that he would have drawn much on it, even if what Judas published was a chronicle in our sense at all, a supposition which is more than doubtful.

(iv) The existence of a chronographer of the tenth year of Antoninus Pius (A. D. 147–148) has been assumed in explanation of the curious coincidence that both Clement of Alexandria (once) and Epiphanius (once) employ this year as a term in chronological calculations. The latter interrupts his series of bishops of Jerusalem, after the twentieth bishop Julianus, with the note, 'all these down to the tenth year of A. Pius,' *Haer.* lxvi 1. The former tells us that 'Josephus reckons from Moses to David 585 years, from David to the second year of Vespasian 1179 years, and from that to the tenth of Antoninus seventy-two years,' *Strom.* i 21 147; and as the mention of this last date cannot come either from Josephus, who wrote half a century before it, or from Clement himself, who wrote half a century after it, it is a reasonable supposition that it is borrowed from some other intermediate writer, who will also have been the source of Epiphanius. This lost writer is conjectured by Schlatter[1], following von Gutschmid, to be identical with the Judas mentioned above; but something more than mere conjecture is wanted before we can accuse Eusebius of mistaking the tenth year of Severus for the tenth of A. Pius. With better judgement, Harnack suggests Cassianus. In neither of these cases can Eusebius have been acquainted with the lost chronography; if Cassianus was the author, we have seen that Eusebius knew nothing of him; if Judas, we must conclude that Eusebius knew next to nothing of a book which *ex hypothesi* he dated fifty years too late.

(v) Hippolytus, the last great Greek writer of the Roman Church, was a prolific contributor to the studies that border on chronology. His Paschal cycle was published in the first year of Alexander Severus, A. D. 222; his Chronicle, in the thirteenth year of the same emperor, A. D. 234. But the Latin translations of this Chronicle of Hippolytus (for the book is lost in the original Greek) show that it was rather a collection of materials for chronology than a chronicle like that of Eusebius. The only materials given for the centuries after Christ were lists of emperors and of popes with length of tenure, *imperatores Romanorum ab Augusto et quis quot annis imperauit, nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quot annis praefuit.* The list of emperors is extant[2], and it presents no points of contact whatever with Eusebius. At best then he can have been but slightly indebted to Hippolytus[3].

(vi) What was much more likely to serve Eusebius in the way of a source lay near his hand in the shape of the last Chronicle of this list, that of Julius Africanus of Nicopolis (Emmaus) in Palestine. Africanus is a personage of more than ordinary interest, for he combined the widest Christian culture and scholarship with an active participation in civil life. In the one capacity he headed the embassy of his fellow-citizens which obtained a new foundation for their town; in the other, he demonstrated the impossibility of identifying the darkness of the Crucifixion with an eclipse, and disproved the Hebrew authorship of the story of Susanna against an opponent as redoubtable as Origen. It is certain then that his Chronicle (published in the fourth year of Elagabalus, A.D. 221 [1]) represented the highest attainable standard of the day; it is certain also that Eusebius was familiar with it, for he not only mentions it in the *History* (vi 31), but alludes to Africanus in the *Chronicle* as 'the chronographer [2].' To what extent Eusebius may have borrowed from him, it is less easy to say. If Africanus was, as Photius says, very brief for the Christian period, the debt to him in the way of material cannot have been large; how far it may have included the episcopal lists will appear in the sequel. On the other hand, the debt in the way of method and system may easily have been larger, for these are not matters affected by brevity or prolixity. And it is natural to believe that the accuracy of arrangement from Tiberius to Septimius Severus which we have noted in Eusebius' *Chronicle* derives directly from a chronographer of the early third century: from whom then so likely as from Africanus?

---

[1] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XII i p. 28 ff.

[2] *Chronica Minora*, ed. Mommsen, I i 137, 138 (in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*).

[3] I might perhaps have spoken more strongly, but I prefer to leave open at this point all questions relating to the episcopal lists.

The broad results then of this inquiry into the relation of Eusebius to the older chronographers are, firstly, that no direct contact can be shown to exist, and none probably did exist, between him and the chronographers of the second century; secondly, that, as for those of the third century, he did borrow some part of the framework of his chronological system from Africanus, while with regard to the episcopal lists his relation to Africanus (and Hippolytus) will call for examination at a later point; thirdly, that for the rest of his material no general dependence on any of his predecessors can be established or even made probable. For the bulk of his notices of persons and events Eusebius appears to have been indebted to nothing beyond his own reading.

These preliminary inquiries have dealt in turn with the text of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, with its chronological method, and with its relation to older chronographers. It has been shown, first, that the true text is to be looked for primarily in Jerome's version: secondly, that the year of the three systems, Abrahamic Olympiad and Imperial, of which the chronological framework consists, is probably identical and is reckoned from the early autumn, and that each emperor commences his first year in the autumn following his accession: thirdly, that of this framework at least the imperial years down to the beginning of the third century may probably have been derived from the chronographer Julius Africanus. The results of these inquiries form the necessary equipment for the task of investigating and weighing the evidence of Eusebius on the main subject of this paper. It only remains to conclude this prefatory matter with a brief estimate of the value which Eusebius himself attached to his lists of the episcopal successions in the great sees.

---

[1] Photius however (*cod.* 34) speaks of it as cataloguing events only down to Macrinus (A.D. 217), ἐπιτροχάδην δὲ διαλαμβάνει καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ μεχρὶ τῆς Μακρίνου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων βασιλέως βασιλείας.

[2] *Iulio Africano scriptore temporum* (Jerome), Ἰουλίου Ἀφρικανοῦ τοῦ τὰ χρονικὰ συγγραψαμένου (*Chron. Pasch.*, doubtless from Eus.).

As is well known, Eusebius gives both in the *Chronicle* and in the *History* complete lists of the succession of bishops in the four churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, from the apostles' days down to his own. Their supreme importance in his eyes appears to be proved, as to the *Chronicle*, from the fact that the entries about these successions outnumber all the other Christian notices put together, and as to the *History* from the opening words, where the 'successions from the holy apostles' stand first among the objects which the author declares that he has set himself to record. Yet Harnack—desirous, as may be gathered from his language, that one whom he admires so greatly should not be allowed to pass as a 'catholic' thinker in the sense of Irenaeus and Tertullian—has asserted (p. 64) that the real reason why Eusebius used imperial rather than episcopal chronology for his framework was that the 'successions from the holy apostles' were for him the lines not only of bishops but of teachers, and that as he did not possess a complete chronology of the latter he determined to make only a subordinate use of the chronology of the former.

Now, in the first place, common sense suggests that Eusebius could not, even if he had desired to do so, have used the 'episcopal successions' as his principal framework of chronology, for the sufficient ground that these were not one but four in number, and who would date every event by synchronisms with four different persons? In this lies the simple explanation of the use of the imperial chronology—not in any doubt as to the meaning of 'the successions from the apostles.' In the second place, it is indeed true that Eusebius occasionally uses the phrase διαδοχή, ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχή, in a wide sense, in which the 'succession' or 'succession from the apostles' applies to the faithful generally (*H. E.* vi 9, vii 19, and perhaps viii praef.) as the embodied tradition of the Christian life and creed from the apostles' time onward: this is the natural language of emphasis on the continuity of the Church as a whole, and in no way excludes a special and unique sense in which the 'succession' from the apostles is preserved and represented in the 'successions' of the bishops of the various churches. But it is untrue that a 'succession of teachers' is even remotely suggested as a rival to the 'succession of bishops': in the solitary passage which could seem to give any colour to this view (*H. E.* v 11), the 'apostolic succession' cannot be that of 'teachers' only, since it is hereditary from 'father to son.' And it is untrue also, as far as I can see, that διαδοχαί in the plural, the definite 'lines of succession,' is ever used of anything but the episcopal successions. At least the opening words of the *History*, already referred to, are patient of only one meaning: 'the successions of the apostles with the chronology of the period since Christ, the chief events of ecclesiastical history, the leading men in the most illustrious churches, those who came forward to represent our religion whether by word of mouth or in writings; the heretics; the Jews and their calamities; the persecutions and the martyrs.' Eusebius here sums up the subject-matter of his history under four heads: the life of the Church in itself, and its external relations with heretics, with the Jews, and with the State; the first and most important head being subdivided into four again: episcopal successions, leading facts, leading men, apologists. No other interpretation explains the connexion of the 'successions' with the chronology, for it is the bishops of the great sees alone (apart from the emperors) whose dates are continuously recorded 'since Christ'; while Harnack's interpretation makes the fourth sub-division meaningless, for to him the 'teachers' or 'ambassadors' of the Christian religion, ὅσοι κατὰ γενεὰν ἑκάστην *ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τὸν θεῖον ἐπρέσβευσαν λόγον*, are integral constituents of the 'lines of succession,' and not a separate class at all[1].

Just then as Eusebius crowded his *Chronicle* with the episcopal successions, so too he placed them in the very forefront of his *History*; the one process interprets and confirms the other. Nor was the place thus allotted to them disproportionate to his underlying thought. To him, as to Irenaeus[2], the successions of bishops in the apostolic sees were the most tangible and trustworthy proof of the continuity of the Church of the apostles with the Church of later days. We shall but be carrying out his own leading ideas if we proceed to test with some minuteness the accuracy and historical value of the lists he has thus compiled.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON HARNACK AND EUSEBIUS.

With the principle laid down above as to the independence of Eusebius for most of his subject-matter Harnack agrees (p. 45): 'The great majority of these [dates] postulate no chronographical tradition, but are the outcome of Eusebius' own study' of original documents. He finds, indeed, three apparent exceptions in the three pairs of references to Valentinus, to Justin, and to Clement of Alexandria; for since Eusebius cannot be supposed to have had two views himself about the date of the same personage, it would be natural to suppose that the alternative date is repeated from some older chronicle. But, as he then points out (p. 53), all the double dates recur in the *History*, and a comparison of the details shows that Eusebius had good reason for the duplication in each case. The whole matter indeed is far simpler than Harnack's rather laboured treatment of it would suggest: he is haunted by the chimera of a distinction between dated and undated notices, and the consequent belief that in every dated notice Eusebius had some reason, good or bad, for selecting the particular year. (1) Of Valentinus it is said under A. Pius 3—exactly in the middle of the episcopate of Hyginus—that he 'came to Rome under Hyginus,' and under A. Pius 6—after the accession of bishop Pius—that he 'is famous and remains till Anicetus.' These are simply the two limbs of a single sentence of Irenaeus, quoted as a whole in the *History* (iv 11 : 'Valentinus came to Rome under Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained till Anicetus'), but resolved into its component chronological parts in the *Chronicle.* (2) In the case of Justin, the first notice under A. Pius 4 relates to his Apology, the second under A. Pius 17 to his martyrdom: the dates are no doubt wrong, but they refer to different events which are naturally enough distinguished from one another. (3) In the case of Clement, the earlier notice under Severus 2 marks his connexion with Pantaenus his predecessor and teacher, the later under Severus 12 his connexion with Alexander his friend and contemporary. When once it is realized that Eusebius, like other chronographers, often had to assign to some definite year or other things which, like the *floruit* of a writer, belong rather to a period than a year, and sometimes, even for things which did belong to particular years, had to invent the exact date if he was unable to discover it, there can be no difficulty in admitting that all these pairs of synchronisms could have been constructed by him on his own account.

---

[1] What is to be said of the argument (p. 66 n. 1) that 'Heinrici rightly refers to Eusebius' quotation (*H. E.* iii 10) of the phrase *ἡ τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβὴς διαδοχή* from Josephus: Eusebius was able to repeat it without remark because he knew of other [Christian] successions than the single one of bishops'? The words occur in the middle of Josephus' enumeration of the canonical books. Does either Harnack or Heinrici gravely suppose that if Irenaeus or any other 'catholic' theologian had desired to quote this list of the Old Testament writings, he would have felt bound to subjoin the caution that Josephus used the word 'succession' in a loose and inadequate sense?

[2] It need hardly be added that Eusebius looked at the matter rather from a historical, Irenaeus rather from a doctrinal, point of view.

On this question, the authority Eusebius attributed to his own dates as given in the *Chronicle* can be tested in a very instructive way by a comparison with the *History*: it is one of the special merits of Harnack's book that it brings into such strong relief the need for combined treatment of the two works. Speaking generally, then, Eusebius will be found to repeat in the *History* the exact dating of the *Chronicle* when, and only when, it was more than guess-work: for the remainder he employs vaguer synchronisms with the persons or events last mentioned, or with the emperor whose reign he is narrating.

Here, again, Harnack has discovered a rule which, though not without some foundation in fact, is far from having the universal validity he seeks to establish for it. According to him the entire chronology of the *History* is ranged round the emperors, and he shows himself as anxious here to magnify Eusebius' interest in the imperial succession as he is elsewhere to minimize his interest in the episcopal succession. No one, indeed, would deny that the succession of the emperors is the 'backbone,' as Bishop Lightfoot calls it, of the chronology in the *History* : in a history, where rough synchronisms are what is wanted (as opposed to a chronicle), some such arrangement was inevitable, and the only alternative to a continuous use of the emperors would have been a continuous use of the popes. It is true that distinct traces of the latter use are found in the West long before Eusebius' time (see an excellent *catena* in Harnack, pp. 164–171): it is true also that the Acts of the martyrs by their emphatic assertion of the 'reign of our Lord Jesus Christ' bear witness to a reluctance on the part of their authors to reckon simply according to the years of the persecuting world-power: but after all even the Acts do mention at the same time the imperial reigns, and it surely would have been much more surprising to find in an eastern writer of Eusebius' day, whatever his views, a system of papal than one of imperial chronology. Thus Eusebius' use of the emperors is perfectly natural as far as it goes: it must, however, be pointed out that, in spite of Harnack, it is not consistent or thoroughgoing. The division of the *History* into books is independent of the secular chronology: Book v, for instance, cuts right across the reign of M. Aurelius, for its first chapters deal with events belonging to his seventeenth year. If the vague date for a bishop or writer is generally measured by an emperor's reign, it is at least occasionally measured by his contemporaries. Sometimes, indeed, it may be doubted whether κατὰ τοῦτον, 'in his time,' refers to an emperor mentioned some time before or to a Christian contemporary just mentioned: but in other cases where the plural is used (καθ' οὓς, ἐπὶ τῶνδε, or the like) of a time when the imperial power was held by a single ruler, the reference to Christian contemporaries is undeniable. Yet even here Harnack sticks to his thesis and would supply χρόνους, χρόνων, 'in these times,' i.e. 'in the times of this emperor': but 'this explanation is impossible' (Lightfoot, *S. Clement*, i 165). In fact the illustrious Berlin professor is greater as a historian than as a scholar: he consistently makes ἐν τούτῳ mean 'under this emperor,' and ἐπὶ τούτοις 'at this time' (pp. 14, 15), and bases important conclusions on these mistranslations; and, worst of all, he turns (p. 220) Philip of Side's definition of Emmaus as the village 'where Cleopas and his companion[s] were going' (Ἐμμαοὺς τῆς κώμης τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ ἐν ᾗ οἱ περὶ Κλεόπαν ἐπορεύοντο, cf. Luc. xxiv 13) into the historical statement that 'the descendants of Cleopas had removed to Emmaus'!

C. H. TURNER.

[*To be continued.*]

THE NAZIRITE.

It is sometimes of service merely to re-open questions; to examine and criticize a prevalent theory without at the same time replacing it by another theory. This is what I propose to do in the present paper with regard to the institution of Naziriteship.

Nazirites are known alike to the earliest and latest periods of the history of the Hebrews in Palestine. The stories of the Nazirite Samson, now incorporated in the Book of Judges, are among our earliest sources, and belong perhaps to the tenth century B.C., and certainly to some period before Amos. Josephus in the first century A.D. still refers to Nazirites as familiar features in the society of his own time. During the millennium that elapsed between the earlier and the later of these two dates, did the institution remain unchanged? If it changed, can the changes be traced?

Where the data are so few as they happen to be in the present case, it is tempting to make the most of them, and to infer that what was true of the Nazirite at any period was true at every other; or again, to press into the service references which we are not really justified in interpreting of Nazirites at all.

On the other hand, it is antecedently probable that a thousand years, and even five hundred, saw changes, and possibly very radical changes. I shall make no apology, therefore, for attempting to discover differences rather than harmonies between the various descriptions of and references to Nazirites which we possess. The present discussion is intended to be purely tentative.

The fullest account of the Nazirite is contained in the Law of Numbers vi. It will be convenient to examine other accounts and references from the standpoint of this law, to see how far they pre-suppose or exclude any or all of the regulations therein contained. It is not very necessary to determine for this purpose the date of the law in question. It will be sufficient therefore to say here that it forms part of the Priestly Code, that term being used in its widest sense as including the secondary as well as the primary elements in the priestly part of the Pentateuch. The date of the literary origin of the law falls somewhere about or after 500 B.C.

(i) *The vow.*—Naziriteship according to the law in Numbers vi is the result of a vow on the part of the person who becomes a Nazirite[1]. On the other hand, there is no evidence that either Samson or Samuel or the Nazirites mentioned in Am. ii 11 ff. ever took a vow; though Samuel is the subject of a vow taken by his mother (1 Sam. i 11). Like a prophet (Jer. i 5), the Nazirite of early times might be sanctified from the womb (Judg. xiii 5).

(ii) *The term.*—This brings us at once to an obvious difference which has always been recognized, though not perhaps sufficiently explained. The law is concerned with a terminable vow; Samuel and Samson are Nazirites for life. Were these two forms of Naziriteship—the permanent and the temporary—equally ancient? If not, which was the more ancient? And was the younger a mere development from the elder? Did permanent and terminable Naziriteship always, did they ever, co-exist? In the present section I will simply state and examine the direct evidence. Indirectly the treatment of the hair (see next section) bears on the question.

a. There is no direct evidence of the existence of temporary Nazirites before the Exile. Samson was a Nazirite for life (Judg. xiii 5, 7); Samuel was to remain unshorn all his days (1 Sam. i 11). In both the foregoing cases the Nazirite was intended to be such from birth to death. The remaining early reference to Nazirites is in Am. ii 11 ff.—'I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazirites. . . . But ye gave the Nazirites wine to drink: and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not.' Here the Nazirites are mentioned as a parallel class to the prophets; like the prophets, they owe their position to JAHWÈ, not to any vow they have taken upon themselves; and there is as little reason for supposing that their calling was temporary as there would be for thinking that the prophetic calling was such.

---

[1] See also *Nazir*—the tract of the Mishna which deals with Nazirites—*passim*, and, though the term Nazirite is not actually used, Acts xxi 23 ff., Jos. *B. J.* ii 15. 1.

b. Post-exilic references to Nazirites chiefly, if not exclusively, are to temporary Nazirites. The Nazirites mentioned in 1 Mac. iii 49 ff. 'had accomplished their days'; and Josephus (*Ant.* xix 6. 1) refers to a large number of temporary Nazirites (Ναζιραίων . . μάλα συχνούς). There is another passage in Josephus (*B. J.* ii 15. 1), which, though it does not mention them by name, almost certainly refers to Nazirites, and this also illustrates the frequency of temporary Nazirites in the first century A.D. Speaking of Bernice's presence in Jerusalem in order to fulfil a vow, Josephus goes on to say that it was customary with people overtaken by illness or otherwise in distress to make a vow, and, for thirty days before discharging it, to abstain from wine and from shaving the hair [1]. The four men also for whom Paul was at charges that they might shave their heads (Acts xxi 23 ff.) seem to have been Nazirites. It appears to have been a common act of benevolence or generosity to defray the cost of the offerings required of persons bound by a vow of Naziriteship [2]. Finally, from the tractate *Nazir* also it appears that temporary Naziriteship was common in later Jewish history; and that the vow, very generally taken for thirty days, was lightly made, frequently almost assuming the character of a bet (cf. *Nazir* v 6 ff.).

c. Certain and direct evidence of life-long Nazirites at this later period is, I think, lacking. The case of John the Baptist is often cited (so recently *e.g.* by Plummer on Lk. i 15). But the absence of any allusion to the most characteristic mark of the Nazirite, viz. the growth of the hair, renders the instance very precarious. Hegesippus' description (in Eusebius *H. E.* ii 23. 4–6) of 'James the brother of the Lord' comes much nearer. But the truth is, the descriptions of John the Baptist in the Gospels (Mt. iii 4 = Mk. i 6 = Lk. i 15; Mt. xi 18 = Lk. vii 33), and of James in Eusebius are descriptions of permanent *ascetics* (cf. especially Mt. xi 18 = Lk. vii 33 for John); and their practice in so far as it resembles that of the Nazirite is but *part* of their ascetic life. We have no ground for thinking that the permanent Nazirites of early Israel were ascetics; Samson must strike us as very much the reverse. The best evidence for permanent Nazirites in later Judaism is *Nazir*. But are the regulations for the life-long Nazirite there given called forth by the actualities of life or the speculative legalism of the Rabbis? This is too large a question to discuss here.

---

[1] Ἐπεδήμει δὲ [Βερνίκη] ἐν τοῖς Ἰεροσολύμοις εὐχὴν ἐκτελοῦσα τῷ Θεῷ. τοὺς γὰρ ἢ νόσῳ καταπονουμένους, ἤ τισιν ἄλλαις ἀνάγκαις, ἔθος εὔχεσθαι πρὸ τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν. ἧς ἀποδώσειν μέλλοιεν θυσίας οἴνου τε ἀφέξεσθαι καὶ ξυρήσεσθαι τὰς κόμας. The abstention from shaving during the thirty days is an implication, not, if the text be correct, a direct statement of the passage.

[2] Cf. *Nazir*, ii 5 ff., '(If any one says), I will be a Nazirite and will bind myself to shave a Nazirite, and his comrade hear and say, I also I will be a Nazirite and bind myself to shave a Nazirite; then if they are wise they will shave one another, and if not, they will shave other Nazirites (הריני נזיר ועלי לגלח נזיר ושמע חבירו ואמר ואני ועלי לגלח נזיר אם היו פקחים מגלחים זה את זה ואם לאו מגלחים נזירים אחרים).' On this Bartenora comments—The meaning is, he enters on Naziriteship himself and undertakes to furnish the offerings for another Nazirite. Similarly Maimonides. So when Josephus records (*Ant.* xix 6. 1) that Agrippa ordered many Nazirites to be shaved, we are no doubt to understand that the king defrayed the cost of the requisite offerings (note the context of the passage).

To sum up: permanent Nazirites were a familiar feature in early Hebrew society; a case needs to be made out for the existence of temporary Nazirites before the Exile, though the paucity of our evidence does not justify us in using the *argumentum e silentio* to deny their existence: after the Exile down to the Fall of Jerusalem, temporary Nazirites were numerous, permanent Nazirites probably rare, if known at all, in actual life.

(iii) *The treatment of the Nazirite's hair.*—The growth of the hair is common to both forms of Naziriteship; it plays a conspicuous part in the Samson stories; it is the subject of one of the regulations in the law. It was so characteristic a feature of the Nazirite that, at least as early as the sixth century B.C., Nazirite was used metaphorically of an unclipped vine (Lev. xxv 5, 11). It would almost appear from Judg. xvi 17 that it was at one time the only essential characteristic of the Nazirite. The growth of the hair is the most certainly permanent feature of the Nazirite from the earliest to the latest times. And yet even here a most significant difference emerges. The hair of a temporary Nazirite becomes at the close of the period of the vow a *hair offering* (Num. vi 18); but this is precisely what the hair of the life-long Nazirite never was and never could be. Is the treatment of the hair in the former case, then, a mere modification of the treatment in the latter? Is it not at least equally probable that it has an independent origin, and that the striking difference in the end and purpose of the two treatments is to be thus explained?

Neither treatment should be explained as to its origin by peculiarly Hebrew ideas; for both treatments are wide-spread and originate in very primitive doctrine[1]; viz. that the hair, whether remaining on the body or cut off, is, so to speak, part of the man's personality; hence, (1) if it is considered important to preserve a man's personality intact, his strength undiminished, he is never shorn at all; (2) shorn hair must be preserved from improper uses, especially from falling into the hands of one's foes, for power over the hair would give them power also over the man; (3) for the same reason shorn hair is a most suitable sacrifice; it is the offering of a part of one's self. The treatment of the hair of the permanent Nazirite must be explained by (1); that of the temporary Nazirite by (3) rather than by (2), for the fact that the hair is burnt in the altar fire points to its sacrificial character[2]. There are other instances of what may reasonably be explained as survivals of hair-offerings among the Hebrews: such are the shaving of the head for the dead (e.g. Deut. xiv 1; see Driver's note on the passage) and, possibly, Absalom's annual cutting of his hair (2 Sam. xiv 26). In any case the growth of the hair is not so peculiar to the two forms of Nazirites that we need on this account to explain the treatment of the hair by the temporary Nazirite as a mere modification of its treatment by the permanent Nazirite. The converse supposition is very unlikely; if the hair was first suffered to grow in order that it might furnish an offering, it is exceedingly improbable that the practice was so modified that the offering became an impossibility.

(iv) *Avoidance of pollution by a dead body.*—Dead bodies were in general a cause of pollution (Num. xix): the special regulation laid down in the law for a Nazirite who became thus polluted is quite intelligible as a regulation for persons under a *temporary* vow. Pollution of this kind may befall any one quite accidentally; if the vow is temporary and has been accidentally interrupted, it can be recommenced as the law provides (Num. vi 9–12). This is impossible if Naziriteship was in the first instance intended to be life-long. Could such regulations have been framed for a large class of life-long devotees such as the Nazirites appear to have been (see above, sect. ii *a*)? The only other instance of any one being forbidden to incur pollution by the dead under any circumstances is that of an individual—the high priest (Lev. xxi 10 ff.). But we may go further: the very purpose and character of Samson's life is inconsistent with avoidance of pollution by the dead: cf. particularly Judg. xv 8, 16. Samuel, too, must have suffered pollution when he 'hewed Agag in pieces' (1 Sam. xv 33). The difficulty was already perceived and, in their own way, met by the early Rabbis: Samson, so they inferred, belonged to an entirely different order of Nazirites, subject to entirely different regulations from those laid down in the law. 'What is the difference between a perpetual Nazirite (i. e. one who has taken the vow according to the law for life) and a Nazirite of the Samson type? A perpetual Nazirite, when his hair becomes heavy, may lighten it (by cutting it) with a razor, and must then present the three (sacrificial) animals (Num. vi 14); and if he becomes (accidentally) defiled (by contact with the dead) he must bring the offering (required in the case) of (such) defilement (Numb. vi 9–12). A Nazirite of the Samson type must never cut his hair when it grows heavy; on the other hand, if he becomes polluted by the dead he does not bring the offering (required by the law in the case) of (such) defilement[1],' *Nazir* i 2. Permission to cut the hair of the perpetual Nazirite seems based on the practice of Absalom (2 Sam. xiv 26), who was held to have been a perpetual Nazirite[2]. It is then no mere *argumentum e silentio* that enables us to assert that at least one regulation of the law did not apply to the perpetual Nazirite of early times.

---

[1] Cf. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, i 193–207; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*³, ii 401; Robertson Smith, *Religion of Semites*², pp. 323–333; Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, i 247–251; *Vendîdâd*, Fargard xvii, with Darmesteter's introductory note, S. B. E. iv p. 185 ff.

[2] Cf. the treatment of hair by the Arabs at the close of a vow, Wellhausen, *Reste*, p. 118.

(v) *Abstinence from all products of the vine and from all intoxicants.*—Was this a permanent element in Naziriteship? Much depends on the amount of prejudice we feel justified in carrying with us from the law (Num. vi 4) to our consideration of the earlier passages. In view of the conclusion reached in the preceding section, we may well consider them without such prejudice. Taking them *seriatim* we notice—

a. The case of Samuel. The story of Samuel's birth (1 Sam. i) is drawn from a source probably belonging to the eighth century B.C. If we might follow the LXX in 1 Sam. i 11, the enforcement on Nazirites of abstinence from intoxicants would be clearly established for that period. For in the LXX Hannah's vow with regard to Samuel includes the clause, absent from the Hebrew, *καὶ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίεται*. But the LXX is 'probably an amplification of the Hebrew text, by means of elements borrowed from Num. iii 9, xviii 6, vi 3 designed with the view of representing Samuel's dedication as more complete'[1]. This then leaves us without conclusive evidence either one way or the other. Samuel used to be present on festal occasions when it can scarcely be doubted that wine was drunk, and we are never told that he himself abstained; see 1 Sam. ix 11 ff. (from one of the earliest sources incorporated in the book of Samuel, belonging to the tenth or ninth century B.C.), 1 Sam. xi 14 ff., xvi 2 ff.

---

[1] מה בין נזיר עולם לנזיר שמשון נזיר עולם הכביד שערו מיקל בתער ומביא שלוש בהמות ואם נטמא מביא קרבן טומאה נזיר שמשון הכביד שערו אינו מיקל ואם נטמא אינו מביא קרבן טומאה.

[2] See Bartenora and Maimonides on *Nazir* i 2 in Surenhusius, *Mishna*.

b. Samson. It is difficult to think of Samson sitting as a teetotaler at the feasts or drinking-bouts (משתה) that he gave. Had the writer had this in mind we should have expected him to dwell on Samson's singularity, rather than on his following the common practice of bridegrooms in his day (Judg. xiv 10).

Against the fact that the stories of Samson do not leave upon us the impression of one who was a total abstainer, we have to set the fact that his mother is bidden to abstain from all intoxicants, all products of the vine, all unclean eatables (Judg. xiii 4, 7, 14). The inference commonly made that the writer thought of the son as permanently subject to the same restrictions, though not necessary, is certainly neither unreasonable nor improbable. But what was the date of the writer in question? This cannot be discussed here; it must suffice to refer to Böhme's discussion[2], in which he argues for the presence of glosses in the story of Samson's birth (Judg. xiii), or to Budde's commentary (pp. 90 ff.) where the position is maintained that that story, itself composite, is later in origin than the other stories about Samson. It is worth observing that the other stories presuppose that part of the angel's message (xiii 4 f.) which refers to the growth of Samson's hair (Judg. xvi 17), but show no knowledge of any of the other restrictions.

c. The Nazirite contemporaries of Amos.—The passage in

---

[1] Driver, *Hebrew Text of Samuel*, pp. 10 f.

[2] *Zeitschr. für die A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1885, pp. 261 ff.

Amos ii 11 ff. gains additional point if we assume that Nazirites at the time were compelled to abstain from wine: but it does not necessarily presuppose such a regulation. There is a passage in Isaiah (xxviii 7) worth citing in this connexion—'the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are gone astray through strong drink: they err in vision, they stumble in judgment.' In the light of this we could explain the passages in Amos as meaning simply—you stopped the activity of the Nazirites by making them intoxicated, and the message of the prophets by forbidding them to speak. Still this is scarcely the most probable explanation: and it may be considered likely that abstinence from wine (though not necessarily also from all products of the vine) goes back as far as the eighth century B.C.

(vi) *The offerings.*—These are made either (*a*) at the end of the period of the vow, or (*b*) on the interruption of a vow by accidental pollution. Since, as we have seen (section iv), the permanent Nazirite was not affected in any special manner by pollution, it is unlikely that the permanent Nazirite ever made any offerings in consequence of his Naziriteship. This constitutes a significant difference; for the offerings in the case of the temporary Nazirite formed an important, perhaps the most fundamental, element in the vow; the abstinences enforced during the period of the vow being subsidiary to the final act. A parallel is afforded by the Arabic Iḥrām[1].

Under the several preceding sections, I have drawn attention to certain indisputable and certain probable or possible differences between the permanent and the temporary Nazirite, or, to put it otherwise, between the Nazirite as known to us from pre-exilic sources and the Nazirite as known to us from post-exilic sources. How are these differences to be accounted for? The data do not justify a very complete or certain answer. But I will conclude with making a few suggestions as to various possibilities and with pointing out the uncertainty of some prevalent theories which are in danger of being put forward as established facts.

1. I have assumed up till now that when the story tells us that Samson was a Nazirite it intends us to understand that he belonged to a clearly defined class marked by certain recog-

---

[1] See Wellhausen, *Reste des Arab. Heidenthums*^{1}, 116–118.

nized peculiarities. This is not absolutely necessary; the word itself simply means a devotee. It is *possible* that the writer may mean nothing more than that he is to be devoted to JAHWÈ, and that he might have used the term Nazirite indifferently of various classes of sacred persons, such as prophets or priests. In that case the earliest use of the term in a more specific sense would be Am. ii 11 ff. But this is not probable. In view of the close association of the term with a reference to the unshorn hair in Judg. xvi 17, and the subsequent metaphorical use of Nazirite of the unclipped vine (Lev. xxv 5), it is tolerably certain that, as early as the tenth century, Nazirite denoted a person devoted to JAHWÈ, and outwardly distinguished by his unshorn locks.

2. The prohibition in the law of wine, strong drink, and the products of the vine, looks as though it were due to a fusion of two heterogeneous customs. Wine may be forbidden either as an intoxicant or as a product of the vine; in the former case all other intoxicants are naturally included in the prohibition ('wine and strong drink'); in the latter all other products of the vine ('wine and the products of the vine'). The former prohibition may have regard to the incapacitating effects of alcoholic liquors (so probably in the case of the priests at the time of officiating, Ezek. xliv 21, Lev. x 9) or to their agreeableness to the appetite, a consideration which may account for abstinence from these liquors during the period of a vow[1]. But neither of these two reasons would account for the prohibition of all products of the vine. This latter prohibition has been explained with much probability as originating in a strict desire to keep to ancient custom; the vine was unknown to the nomads; religious conservatism led certain classes of devotees upon settlement in Canaan, a land of vines, to avoid everything connected with it[2]. The Rechabites, with whom the Nazirites have been compared, were in all probability such a class of devotees maintaining from religious motives an ancient mode of life—abstaining from wine, though not so far as we know from other intoxicants, from planting vineyards, sowing seed, and building houses

---

[1] Cf. the cases of abstinence from wine and women during a vow among the Arabs, cited by Wellhausen, *Reste*¹, 116.

[2] Cf. e.g. Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*¹, p. 152 n; Kayser-Marti, *Theologie des A. T.*² 77; Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* ii 133 ff.

(Jer. xxxv). But if this be the true explanation of the Nazirite custom, it does not account for the prohibition of all intoxicants; for not all intoxicants are unknown to the nomads. It appears to me hazardous to infer that the early Hebrew Nazirites were, like the Rechabites, protestants against the culture and life of Canaan; their abstinence from wine, on which the comparison is generally based, is far from proved; and then again, can Samson, who takes his wives of the people of the land, and who attends their festivals, be seriously regarded as an opponent of Canaanite culture?

3. Possible stages in the growth of Naziriteship. The stories of Samson and Samuel show clearly that in early Israel certain devotees left their hair unshorn in token of their devotion to JAHWÈ. This practice need not be regarded either as a remnant of nomadic life, or as due to Canaanite influence. It is based on beliefs shown by anthropological research to be widespread. Such devotees were sometimes called Nazirites, a term which was, probably as early as the tenth century B.C., specifically employed of devotees who suffered their hair to grow long. In the eighth century Nazirites were a familiar class of sacred persons similar in some respects to the prophets. When we next hear of Nazirites we find them to be persons who take a vow upon themselves for a short period, and at the end of the period make an offering of their hair and present certain animal offerings as well. How can the change be accounted for? I suggest the following as a possible explanation.

Vows were commonly taken in early times; and to judge by analogies, such as those instanced above among the Arabs, and by the later Hebrew practice in the case of the Nazirite's vow, certain abstinences were practised during the period of the vow. In some cases the hair was suffered to grow and offered at the close of the period of the vow. To persons under such vows the term Nazirite, originally used of permanent religious devotees, was extended on account of the common treatment of the hair. But at what period? This cannot be certainly determined. It was possible as soon as the secondary sense of the word Nazirite (a person with unshorn hair) exceeded in prominence the primary sense (a devotee); and this had certainly taken place by the sixth century B.C., as is shown by the metaphorical use of the word in Lev. xxv 5, 11. It is perhaps most likely that the old term received this new application at the time when the old application had ceased to be necessary owing to the disappearance of the class which it had defined.

In this case then the term Nazirite would be ancient, but not as applied to persons under a temporary vow; many regulations in the law of Numbers vi are also ancient, though not originally connected with Nazirites, some being derived from the practice of associating certain inconveniences with the term of a vow, some from the protests of religious classes against prevalent customs. The fusion took place when the origin of the latter type of practices had been lost sight of.

But in detail all this is merely suggestive. My main object has been to raise the question whether the connexion between the permanent Nazirite and the temporary Nazirite was more than nominal and external. If the connexion be only such, it cannot but be misleading to explain the one institution by the other, or to interpret the one set of passages by reference to the other set.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

CHURCH AFFAIRS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

ALL our teachers, from Plato to Bacon, and from Bacon to Mill[1], have shown the worthlessness by itself of the 'study of pottery in the pot.' But there is a work for the reporter of the concrete. We must know 'the pot'; and missions are a part of that great *Datum* from the contemplation of which alone sacred science reaches true and important conclusions. To refuse the gracious invitation of the Editor, might be to suggest that Theology can only regard records, or that the Pastoral life of the Church can be independent of the best Christian thought. It will be fortunate for me if I can do even a small part of their duty who *Naturam rei in ipsa re perscrutantur*, with respect to Christian interests in South Africa and those forces to which no pause for reinforcement will be afforded even by the terrible exhaustion of natural vigour which must follow the present war. The first moment of peace will be the moment of renewed and heavier demands upon every leavening element of Colonial life, and principally upon the Church. Even now it is our duty to consider the conditions under which we may serve in Christ the interests both of the men of our own race or colour, and of the immense native and mixed populations which outnumber them on the whole in the proportion of ten to one, and in some quarters of four hundred to one.

Work, then, among our own near kindred, and work among native tribes to the exclusion of the mixed coloured people, will form the divisions of our present subject. Of both I have seen something in many different quarters of South Africa, and if with less light, yet with more of intimacy than can belong to those who are not tied to the country by the bonds of regular duty.

---

[1] In a letter to Professor Nichol (1834) J. S. Mill speaks of the feebleness and shallowness of an address upon agricultural interests made to agriculturalists by a landowner, who, presumably, had no better preparation for his speech than a practical and feeling interest in the subject of it.

Impressions gathered in days of constant business are distinguished and diminished into clearness in a time of rest. Some opinions become convictions. Yet nothing takes the place of long experience, and one submits every statement, with a strong sense of its tentative character, to the better judgement of old South Africans. There can be no attempt, either, for any man to put down all that he thinks, or to review ever so scantily all his sources of knowledge. Africa is a stimulating subject, and at every stage a great deal must be left unsaid.

Of the religious life among Europeans we can only touch that of the English Church, the Church of South Africa. The Dutch Bodies, which follow the model of Geneva and Scottish Presbyterianism, form a world by themselves of which we know too little. They are probably not directly concerned in the religious future of the English. And although there is much mutual good feeling between different Denominations of Englishmen, yet every clergyman is so busy with his own organization, that we know little with any measure of exactness of anything which lies beyond the limits of the English Church. Of the Dutch it should be said that, during the time of their unchallenged predominance, they impressed upon the laws and customs of the country, upon the minds of the old colonists and even of the old coloured populations, a genuine recognition of Divine Revelation as a reality which should govern life and shape a polity. The institutions which reflect this belief[1] are not yet out of harmony with the mind and temper of the Colony any more than of the Republics. The Dutch have given us much which is worth keeping, and we have reason to pray that the Cape in becoming more English may not become in certain real though limited respects less godly. If the English Church may claim a better name in respect of her dealings with natives, her record has been shorter, her difficulties less, though the temptations of her people have at times not been less tragic; and perhaps the good done is less due to a national effort, than to the sacrifices of individuals. Among the 'old Kaffrarians' of the Eastern Province (it is the honourable style of those who were concerned in the old Border wars) some of the men who have suffered most from the hostilities of natives are now among their warmest friends.

---

[1] For example, the observance of Sunday, Good Friday, Ascension Day, and occasional days of prayer appointed by public authority, has always a large measure of reality.

The English Church in South Africa disappoints some people who are accustomed to the large 'plant,' and the numbers, and the wealth of the Church of England. The disappointment is one which finds a parallel in connexion with the *secular* condition of South Africa. We had heard long before we entered it so much about this country that an over-estimate was inevitable. Twice in twenty years South African affairs have been in the blazing focus of political interest. Great forces are at work there and a great future at stake. And accordingly new comers are unprepared for the unsubstantial roughness of Capetown, and the rare evidences of wealth in the country. As an English country it is still new, or at least still primitive. It has prolonged the period of rawness, and possesses a kind of downy antiquity, an old-established youth. Paedogenesis has happened as in *Axolotl*, and the 'Old Colony' has been too busy creating new ones, to grow mature herself. Most of the inconveniences are, or were before the war, in the course of being remedied. But in aspect our western port still falls behind what an Englishman has pictured as the centre of interests so stirring, and just as men expect more of the State, so they expect of the Church more than they find of the outward equipment of success. In organization, indeed, the Church, as in more famous histories, is here also some stages ahead of the State. She has finished her storms of settlement. Some of the problems which will perhaps arrive at home have here been very successfully solved. But on this very account, and just because we knew so much of the heroic faith which directed her rulers and her faithful people, we could scarcely imagine how slender were her material resources. The Church has bravely marched *pari passu* with the Empire, and spreads on either hand into great regions beyond; her bishops and clergy compose a little army of the hardest material; the native forces of the Church were found in trying times sufficient both in impulse and in directive value. Only the commissariat is in fault, and the ranks by far too thin. British clergymen, like British soldiers, have no chance to fight in column; they are extended over an immense and unmanageable front.

Here is a Church then, whose canonical structure has borne the test of rough labour, and which has successfully made the boldest experiment in lay government; where the different claims of Provincial, Diocesan, and Parochial property are capitally managed; and where priesthood holds its rightful place in presence of the constitutional freedom of a genuine laity, and the constitutional leadership of rulers who have made episcopal government a daily reality rather than an occasional burden. This Church will presently, as we trust, have to provide for a fuller development of English life in South Africa. Is it too much to hope that the eternal want of pence, the scarcity of men, the impossibility sometimes of securing the men who offer themselves, will be relieved in the coming years? Something towards this end must still, even in normal times, be done by England. The country which has enriched individuals is far from rich in the sense of possessing rich residents. The parishes do more on the average for themselves than English parishes do. But the small sum which comes from England, if it were doubled, might give to the Episcopal administration all the difference between the free choice of what is best, and the forced acceptance of what is possible. Colonial life, with its free movement and the open texture of its society, hardens and develops character. But the excellence of the clergy is no good reason for making each man do the work of three. The Grand-Duke Constantine of Russia dreaded a war because it would spoil the troops which his incessant drill had brought to an ideal perfection of *tenue*. There is no tendency, and no need, to save up the forces of the Church in a mere regularity. But there is a limit to the spirit of adventure, and men should not be left single-handed in immense 'parishes,' the size of Cumberland. It is even fortunate that, for the present, supplies from England, of money as well as of men, should be necessary for the Church of South Africa. A conscious dependence upon the home country is still of advantage to us in Church matters as well as in politics and trade. The means raised in the Colonies are, it must be understood, very much greater than those contributed by the benevolent in Great Britain[1], but that indispensable subsidiary supply has a very large effect in keeping our life open to the wide streams of English life, in guarding us against the rigidity which might otherwise attack a small and heavily burdened community. The Church of England's historical relation to the State, as it is at present understood, prevents of course a closer unity of administration between her and the Colonial Church. But even now, while events are perhaps preparing a more generous association in England of different powers, there is nothing to regret in the observable relaxation of the spirit of Provincial self-defence. The time when Provincial independence was the one thing to be guarded has gone by; and there is no good reason to fear that by maintaining a full representation of the complex life of the English Church, Africa will be led to reproduce those superficial variations which are rather the angles of a constrained position, than the evidence of important tendencies of thought.

---

[1] For example in 1896, in the Diocese of Capetown, the sum raised *for ordinary Church purposes* alone in the parishes was £20,700; the sum raised for the Archbishop in England was about £1,500. To both sides of this account an addition

But if the financial dependence were at an end to-morrow, we should still need the personal help of men and women from Great Britain; so spare is the whole framework of society, so small the number who, in that world of gallant and necessary material enterprise, can devote themselves to its higher interests. Africa, the breeder of thousands, is the hungry devourer of chosen leaders; and, for a time beyond our largest practical forecast, our cry to England must still be for strong men.

It is perhaps in Rhodesia, more than anywhere else in South Africa, where the need of men is most keenly felt, and where there will always be the warmest welcome to such as are fit to keep in touch with all classes of Englishmen. The development of that country is already rapid, and there is an effort to direct it. The Chartered Company is quite favourable to all solid works of evangelization or education. The new Education Ordinance shows that, though strictly 'undenominational,' the ruling powers of Rhodesia are actively sympathetic in their attitude to Christianity. In Rhodesia it would be doubly deplorable to see an unleavened society grow up. Other great opportunities have been missed. This one surely will not be. The urgency of the situation is keenly, I had almost said bitterly, felt by many of the new colonists. They see a

---

of many special sums must be made; but the figures given represent the proportion.

bishop full of ardour, but sadly needing reinforcements; and in Rhodesia, in face of the growing volume of intelligent and vigorous English life, it is natural for some to ask whether we can spare any teachers to the natives while the flower of English youth is left unguided, whether it is not a duty to suspend all mission work until the centres of European life are properly equipped.

The complaint, the advice are natural, but they are not sound. The vigour of missions—and it is the second division of our subject—is not the cause anywhere of weakness in the 'white' churches, nor will the neglect of the natives provide better for the English. It will only diminish the total of Evangelical enterprise. The men for the one work are not the men for the other; and however tempting it may be to some, we cannot leave the natives alone. Capetown shows us how little we can afford to leave a non-Christian population untouched; and this even if we set out of account most of the better and truer motives which influence mankind. The Church and society of Rhodesia would be something other than Christian if it could patiently see missionary effort relaxed.

Perhaps there will always be men who, being themselves Christians, talk of the uselessness of Christian missions. In Africa such people generally base their opinion upon some reported saying of an old inhabitant, to the effect that every Kafir Christian is a dishonest man and a good servant spoiled. The old colonist of immense experience, if he ever said a word of the kind, perhaps turns out to be a man who does not know the difference between a Kafir, a Malay [1], and a Cape coloured man of Hottentot blood. He has employed Mohammedans as his porters, and hazards a picture of a Christian Zulu. This is an extreme but not an unknown case. And something approaching this lack of distinction is not uncommon. Now a Kafir is as much like a Malay, as a Swiss guide is like a Jew of Seville. And a coloured man of the Cape may be like anything on the face of the earth. I distrust therefore the judgement of a man who speaks of all these classes together. He is plainly a loose, though an honest, observer. Those who found on his *dictum*, and have never for instance exchanged a word with an experienced magistrate, commonly proceed to say two things; first, that liars are always more numerous than elsewhere in the neighbourhood of a mission station, and secondly, that missionaries have demoralized native society by upsetting the old native customs, and thereby removing the only sanctions of morality which the native mind can apprehend.

---

[1] The Malays proper of Capetown are descended from slaves brought from Java by the early Dutch settlers. They are Mohammedans, and all people of any race or colour who have joined their community and adopted their religion are called in Capetown 'Malays.' They number some thousands and are good citizens.

This sort of speech is almost composed of fallacy. It is based upon a blind attachment to the method of agreement. The neighbourhood of a mission is a neighbourhood of liars and other undesirable people. Grant the statement, which remains without proof. But the neighbourhood of a mission is the neighbourhood of a village, of a white centre, of a railway station, the neighbourhood of shops, of canteens, of idle questioners and idle answers. And all the natives one meets in such a district are not Christians. They all wear clothes indeed in a measure, if the station is a fairly big one. It is a police regulation. One borrows this European raiment to come into town. But it is rash to assume that clothing is the sole criterion and principal machine of the Catholic faith. A Kafir in a coat, in the environs of a brandy-shop, does not fairly give the character to the mission which is trying to close the brandy-shop, and whose sons incur ecclesiastical censure by entering it. In the territories across the Kei, in Tembuland for example and Griqualand East, where it is illegal and even uncommon to serve natives with drink, and where coats are not *de rigueur*, your tourist, surrounded perhaps by ardent Methodists in blanket robes, rejoices over the morality of an unspoiled heathen country! Coats are not Christianity, the 'school-Kafir' is not always baptized, and the mission is not the only influence existing in a white outpost. And yet respectable men, unacquainted with the superior exactness of the proof by differences, will doubtless go on to the end repeating the same foolish 'arguments.'

The other half of their position, one would think, might answer itself. Missions have destroyed the old sanctions of morality! What were these sanctions? and what would have become of them if missions had never moved? They were the practice or supposed practice of putting adulterous wives to death, and so forth. Those who are best acquainted with native traditions have reason to suspect that these savage punishments were very unequally inflicted; that the supposed purity of native manners was largely conventional; and that in the bloodiest times, in Zululand, as in chaster communities, a rich man could do what he chose. A life forfeited could be redeemed with live-stock; and at the best it was only the crime of being found out that was visited. But, supposing for an instant the heathen morality to have been all that is sometimes claimed for it, and the strictness of polygamous marriage guarded by impartial murder, what was to become of it on the advent of a civilized power? Is it imagined that England or Cape Colony would permit every *père de famille* to execute at his will the respondents in his village divorce court? These 'sanctions' of a primitive morality would become in their turn subjects for the police to deal with. No! the ancient discipline, more or less effective as the facts may be, must inevitably disappear before civilization. It is order, police, Imperial sovereignty, the Pax Britannica, which have destroyed the sanctions of the old social system. Missions could do nothing to preserve or to abolish them. They perished when they passed within the frontiers of the Empire; they perished with those perpetual wars which, no doubt, in ages before did much to discipline and decimate the manhood of the tribes, and for which no adequate substitute has yet been provided to occupy their adventurous youth. 'Deprived of warfare,' a bishop said with pathos in my hearing, 'our natives have been forced to turn their attention to beer.'

Shall we have done then with this legend about the missionary's destruction of the patriarchal authority? Can we part with this time-honoured identification of the coat and the creed? There is a line where the coat is common, and the creed rare; whole regions where the creed is conquering and the coat almost unknown. But the sartorial philosophy will probably be too strong for us. There are people who having acquired an opinion will hardly part from it. They dread that they may never get another. Can we, with any face, propose as a substitute for that wear-resisting prejudice, a consideration of the genuine facts of the case; the consideration, namely, of the extraordinary power of the faith, a power which is daily in evidence, to control and to refine native human nature, to sweeten and pacify and strengthen native common life? The more I see and know of native men, and I know many of them very intimately, the more I am amazed at the self-control which the Christians among them maintain in the midst of the disorganization which appears in the lower levels of city life. In Capetown natives who have never before entered a town naturally see little of its better side, but are confronted by every symptom of depravity. Drink, which is illegal in Kaffraria, is offered them by canteens at every corner, and there are many other circumstances of moral disadvantage. Yet, in spite of all this, the men of the mission remain sober and perfectly well conducted, although they have money to spare, for the whole of six months or a year during which they are separated from their families. They give gladly to the support of their mission, they gladly spend their evenings in school or religious instruction, and are content with rough accommodation, for which they pay, and which they regard as a real home and shelter against that which they fear above all things—namely, sin. I fancy that most South Africans know but little either of the discipline to which native Christians freely submit, or of the way in which native Christians are made. They do not know that men, after patiently listening to instruction for a long period, enter with full consideration into the catechumenate, and passing sometimes from their country missions to Capetown and back again more than once, persevere for two years, maybe, and more, before they are baptized. Baptism, as natives are well aware, involves a life-long dedication to those strict ways of conduct which they have followed since admission to the catechumenate; an abandonment of all that licence which, whatever was once the case, now exists in heathen life, and a constant effort to enter more deeply into the Christian faith. It is a yoke which natives put on with a glad heart at last, though they linger before the sacrifice. There is in them an entire absence of that half-shame which tinges too often an Englishman's esteem of his religion. It is to them a matter inexpressibly solemn, real and precious; fenced by painful sacrifices, but every way honourable and great. Even the heathen or the inquirer who turns away, as very many do, often turns away somewhat sorrowful; and if, as may happen, with a frank preference for 'heathen custom,' a phrase for a man's freedom to please his lower nature, it is yet absolutely without any contempt for the state which he cannot afford to embrace. I do not think it would be easy to find among heathen Kafirs any beginning of the notion that their Christian neighbours are hypocrites or weaklings. I know that it happens for their wrath and contempt to be directed against the man who, to gain, as he thought, the 'red' or heathen interest in his neighbourhood, has been faithless to the strict rule of practice which he embraced by being baptized. It is wonderful indeed that neither heathen nor Christian natives seem to judge ill of the Church because of the inconsistent lives of some white Christians. These things seem to pass them by, at least in Capetown. I imagine that they hardly conceive that those are Christians whose carelessness they see. They perhaps suppose them to be excommunicate, and fallen into 'wretchlessness.' For themselves the affair of their salvation is real, and grace works in them with a mighty and evident power; not of course in a sudden elimination of every fault, but in a genuine infusion of faith and hope and love, and the prayer and effort and sorrow which are among their effects. It would seem as if these simple natures, with their direct and uncomplicated passions, their physical vigour and unshaken nerves, move towards Christ as towards a food which their whole being requires, and which they receive and hold fast with the force of a normal desire.

I have seen nowhere in South Africa, in Kaffraria, in Bechuanaland, or in the great centres, anything at all resembling those hasty and skin-deep methods of conversion of which one hears. We have neither the palm-tree nor the palm-oil which haunt the imagination of critics at home. We have not the knowledge required to defend the first missionaries, who are, be it remembered, dead and gone, and unable to answer for themselves. Of modern Presbyterian missions I believe one can safely say that they are fully alive to the importance of digging deep by education the foundations of a Christian society. Blantyre and Lovedale (Scottish missions) are not examples of slight and sanguine methods. It is true that the missions of the Free Church and others are at present disturbed by separate movements of various names[1], which have not yet troubled our churches. But it would very ill become us to congratulate ourselves upon this. We learn from the Presbyterians and Methodists chiefly to grieve over the small scale within which our efforts must be confined. The Jesuits in Rhodesia and Marists in Basutoland, and the Trappists and others near the coast, are probably at least as solid in their methods as any of the ministers we have named. But many things indicate that the Catholic English Church may fit, better than any other, the needs, and weakness, and strength of native character.

Weakness there is as well as strength. Our missionaries are not men working in the dark, or blind to the characteristic faults of their people. Of these faults, no doubt, an imposing chapter may be made. For us who know them these are by no means their most distinguishing features. What need is there to say that rough and uneducated men, bred in bareness, cannot safely be trusted with lengthy accounts or large sums of money? Business capacity and business trustworthiness are matters of long training. What fixes itself in the memory is the gravity, the tenderness, the wholeheartedness, the simplicity, the intelligent grasp of truth, the passionate search for perfection which characterize one Kafir after another. They are singularly without the superstitious temper. Their minds do not turn to symbol or ritual or picturesque fancy. They might have a little more of the enthusiasm of Catholics. But they certainly enter into the meaning and study the proportions of revealed religion. They love the Bible and the Creed, and the Sacraments and the order of the Church: and I am not at all prepared to accept the confident statement of some able men who have never ministered to Africans, that many generations of civilization must pass before they are able to apprehend the simplest ideas of

---

[1] There have been recently three secessions: the 'Ethiopian,' which has American Methodist connexions; the 'Church of Africa,' which is a secession from the Baptists; and the followers of Mzimba, who was, or is, a Presbyterian minister. All these are national or 'colour' movements. Their object is to dispense with the control of white men. As such, rather than as religious movements, they may have considerable importance. They seem to be in every way much to be regretted. In the *Nineteenth Century* for November an interesting account is given by E. M. Green of the first of these movements, and its leader Dwane.

Christianity. It will be found that in the spiritual apprehensions is found the road of least resistance between man and man.

The case of our natives seems to shake the idea that men ought to be brought gradually to Christ; to Mahomet, for example, as a preparation; to some vague supernaturalism before approaching the concrete mysteries of true religion. Their case, if there be any *Law of von Baer* in the development of religions, any recapitulation of the phylogeny in the growth of the individual, seems to go clean against the popular notions of the origin of spiritism. Here is a people with no dreams and fancies, no hauntings of the dead, no rites of propitiation, not an altar, not a priest, no *producible* rudiment even of Theism, and yet they rise to the Christian conceptions as surely as do white men. They ought to require an intermediate system of many stages, if our faith is in reality the flower of an earthly root. We ought to see them first decently superstitious, fearful and fanciful; first they should be attached to grosser propitiations and an easy morality. They ought not to advance from a state as blank and calm as Agnosticism desires to be, to the spiritual conceptions of Evangelical religion, the exercises and the charities and the chastity of conscious communion with God. And yet this is natural enough if 'Christianity' (to use the secular term) is not the last natural upgrowth of human uneasiness, but the gift of God, coming down from on high, and all the better able to engage the desires and satisfy the intellects of men who are natural and free and cool and wide-awake. The state of the Malay, totally impenetrable to any ordinary presentation of the Gospel, satisfied with a system which has made iniquity a law, and rich in the double possession of moral licence and religious pride, with a heart and a face fixed and paralyzed, whereas the Kafir's is only undeveloped and untaught, ought to be a warning to those who, I suppose in ignorance and not in cynicism, advise us to hold back from the plain men of creation the only hope of our poor wandering humanity.

Enough has been said to show that I am no longer of an open mind on the question whether natives ought to or can be made Christians. And for the persuasion of those for whom my witness is thus ruled out, I would appeal with very great confidence to the evidence, not of bishops and priests or professed philanthropists, but to the governors and magistrates of South Africa; to the administrators of Basutoland and of Zululand; to the patriarchal magistrates of the Transkei, who are, I suppose, among the most laborious of the servants of the State, and are certainly among the warmest friends of the native races. It would be well if they would speak. For in England we are still haunted by this phantom of the 'uselessness of missions,' still interested in what was once no doubt a brilliant paradox, and gave evidence of a bold and detached mind. No courage is required in repeating the statement; and there comes a time when a saying to be important should be *true*. It was once an ingenious and original, though an unfounded, thing to say that foreign missions are a waste of treasure, and that we ought to teach our neighbours in England before we care for the heathen. It was clever and bright to wish that 'Africa was dead.' But all that is quite scandalous now. It is wicked without being in the least smart. For Africa is alive for good or for evil, and we every day stimulate it to more and more prolific exhibitions of vitality. We have not the smallest intention of leaving Africa alone till she has yielded the last diamond from her soil. And if ever her mineral treasures are exhausted, the issue of new shares and the 'creation' of new capital will make some men fortunes out of the flurry of her financial death. Buluwayo is Borrioboola-Gha, and we cannot leave the place alone. And as for seeking first the lost sheep of London, the plea for that course is shameful in the only mouths from which it issues, for one does not hear it from the laborious clergymen of our cities; and it is ridiculous when we remember the absurd total in men and in means of the national expenditure upon our whole Evangelical work at home and abroad taken together. If the gallant missionaries of the slums and of the tropics were doubled in numbers to-morrow by a despotic draft upon the educated classes, the number drawn off would not suffice to relieve for long the pressure of overcrowding in a single profession of civil life. It is ridiculous to talk as if the thin ranks of the clergy anywhere were due to an absolute scarcity of human beings. It is due to the immense rarity of Evangelical zeal; and that quality will not be more widely spread by cancelling the various attractions of different parts of Christ's field. We have continually to be reminded that, by a secular standard, our entire missionary equipment is of a slenderness not to be expressed. It is wonderful that so much is done, where so few are called. 'How fiercely,' says (in effect) a correspondent, 'will some intemperate advocate of Christian missions fling at our heads these 90,000 troops,

> 'And oh! of each three thousand, three
> To make a new Thermopylae.'

Of the splendid sacrifices of patriotism we can only think with profound admiration and gratitude. The soldier's service may well for the moment seem the only service for the country. May it be that, trained to large figures by the necessities of Imperial unselfishness, we may undertake in a new temper of generosity this other part of our country's burden, and send a captain's command into the Clergy List, or build a single score of churches for the price of an armoured train. It is certain that Christians, men who really think that Christ is good for the world, must in future give themselves to *His* direct interests *alone*. No diplomacy could succeed which was carried on in the spirit of genial flexibility which marks our attitude towards the Powers of Darkness.

Let us turn from these immodest laments to speak of the admirable opportunities, the open doors which exist in Africa for a stronger advance. Leaving aside the great groundwork, the work of the country districts, the large stations of Kaffraria, fruit of the loyal offerings of poor natives and the generous endowment of (sometimes heathen) chiefs[1]; leaving the districts of the Free State, where the Bechuana, their native system broken up, seem inclined to flock for shelter to the Church; and the stubborn communities of the Lesuto, where native life, preserved by Crown protection, tests the true metal of the Church; leaving also the teeming districts of the old colony, where the steady increase of native populations in numbers and ability makes their conversion a principal hope of future tranquillity; leaving all these, and the memories of delightful days which their mention calls up, we turn to what is at present of more importance, the subject of the great centres which might be centres of the most effective mission work: Capetown, Kimberley, and Johannesburg.

---

[1] It is e.g. to a donation of the chief of the Pondomisi that the large mission of St. Cuthbert's owes its origin.

In the great compounds of Kimberley, where many thousands of natives from every part of South Africa, from the Cape eastwards to the Zambesi mouths, live for six months at a time within walls and under netting, one priest, whose name it honours one to write, the Rev. George Mitchell, exercises single-handed, without plant or buildings, and supported by the contributions of his converts, a ministry of the most widespread effect. Everywhere in South Africa are men, taught by this good father, who are the missionaries of their neighbourhoods. It is of the utmost importance to provide such men with coadjutors *cum jure successionis*. Much is left unsaid when the best feature of 'compound' life has this bare mention.

On the gold-bearing reef of Johannesburg there were said to be, besides all those who were employed in the town, something like 100,000 natives; and this even when the gold industry had begun to be embarrassed by political events. In the better days which we hope to see, no doubt as many will be employed. It is heartbreaking to state that for all this mass of natives no sufficient provision was made by the English Church—the Church which can better address them than any other, meeting them with the regulated discipline and the respect for individual liberty which they need. After the war perhaps this crying want will be supplied; and one can the better name it, because in Johannesburg there would be no financial difficulty.

In Capetown we see nothing like these astonishing numbers, but on this very account are in an unequalled position for giving to natives that steady and practical preparation which is everywhere the aim of the Church, and which makes of men genuine forces for good when they return to their homes.

Of late much larger numbers of Kafirs have come into Capetown than formerly. We speak there of a Kafir invasion, and it really amounts to a great inconvenience and a great opportunity. In a town already crowded with almost every variety of mankind, the untutored Kafir is certainly a troublesome arrival. He does not know, to put it briefly, how to live in a house. He needs special accommodation, and a few special rules. It ought to be impossible for him to get drink; and he should have schools and churches near him, where he will willingly learn to be a good citizen and a Christian, and take back to his home real gains from the city. He ought not to be allowed to settle in the Peninsula, nor to leave it a worse man; and neither thing is necessary if only we can rise to our opportunity, an opportunity which typifies on a single spot the state of the whole African Church.

For Capetown is, in a very unusual sense, far more than any European capital, the representative centre of the huge country in which it stands. It was eclipsed of late by Johannesburg as a place of wealth and trade; it is less English than Durban and Kimberley, and very likely further in spirit from London than remote Buluwayo; but it remains the mart of life, the central exchange of human nature in the whole sub-continent. It may seem absurd to speak of our poor city in terms which belong either to the civitas or the ecclesia of Imperial Rome. But things have their proportions, and for Africa Capetown is a true metropolis. Hither certainly, though certainly not to the Church, it is necessary, *propter potentiorem principalitatem*, for all Africans, by representation, to convene. Here the Church might gather news of the faith in every tribe and place, and send forth reporters of the Truth into every quarter. A single street in Capetown may sometimes show examples of all the component elements of African life. There are white men of every race; Moslem citizens of the town fresh returned in dazzling raiment from the sacred places of Islam; natives from the Territories, more rarely from Zululand and Matabeleland; a lingering Hottentot or two from the back country dorps, a Bushman even; members of strange black tribes from beyond Zambesi and from Central Africa; Mohammedan natives from Zanzibar; pure-blooded negroes, markedly different from all the Bantu tribes, who have come from the West Coast to serve in the Navy; 'Indian Malays,' as we call them, that is, Mohammedans from India; and a few of the Hindoos who swarm in Natal; and above all the famous C. C. P., the Cape Coloured People, who combine dark blood of every kind, African and Asiatic, and in every degree, with descent from various white stocks—Dutch, Scandinavian, French, and English. Into this concourse of colours and races has come the growing stream of Kafirs, not, we hope, to stop, for the Peninsula affords no room for the life to which they are fitted, but to labour for a few months and return to their rolling grassy downs, and to the wholesome pastoral life in which they can best rear the next generation. It is their presence, in a continually renewed stream, which makes Capetown, though distant from any native district, yet a strategic centre for native mission work. Something is attempted, and there is a full return for the attempt. A large correspondence with country missions is soon established. Nothing could be more touching than the continual proofs of faithful zeal which meet those who teach in a Home for Natives in Capetown and its surrounding mission. Christian men are glad to give their regular services unpaid to the work of preaching ; they attend classes of instruction, and Sunday after Sunday, in the town, and on the mountain, and at stations round both the Bays, native lay evangelists are doing careful work among their kinsmen. This work might be immensely strengthened and extended if men could give an undivided attention to it ; the preaching spots would become chapels, and each chapel would have its school. One is tempted to say that much might easily be accomplished if our men and women of the Church, our servants of the idea in Africa, were not so few, so overburdened already with tasks still more urgently, much more evidently, pressed upon the obedience of Christians in that place.

In besieged Kimberley, soon, we pray, to be free, in desolated Johannesburg, one day to be restored, finally in Capetown, lies something like an abstract of the needs and the opportunities of all South Africa. Half unconscious of her need, she yet represents it eloquently to those who love her. Her many hopes lie waiting for deliverance ; waiting, above all, for more men and women able to consecrate all their force to the higher interests of our countrymen ; more men and women prepared to go beyond the limits of our race, and see what things are done by God among the heathen.

P. N. WAGGETT.

EDWARDINE VERNACULAR SERVICES BEFORE THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK.

THE history of the preparation of the First Book of Common Prayer of 1549 is a subject which is wrapped in much obscurity. It is difficult to determine with any degree of accuracy who the divines were who were responsible for the actual drafting of the book, or what were the steps which they took, and the stages through which they passed, on the way to accomplish their task. Something was done a few years ago to throw light upon this darkness by the publication of the Draft Services contained in Brit. Mus. MS 7. B. iv[1]. These are of great value as representing the growth of ideas and the development of preparatory studies for Divine Service in the mind certainly of Cranmer and probably of those who were acting with him. But these drafts clearly never went beyond the study of Cranmer and the revisers, and they belong to the earlier stages of development, the first being probably anterior to the accession of Edward VI, and the second not long subsequent to it. Practical experiments, however, were made beforehand, as well as literary drafts; and, though attention has been called often enough to the fact that such experiments were made, and to the evidence which testifies to them, nothing has hitherto been produced to show of what the experimental services consisted.

There are in the British Museum and the Bodleian Library some manuscripts which will throw light upon this dark point of the history and explain the character of the experimental services. But before giving an account of them it will be best to gather together the few and scattered notices which mention the performance of service in English in preliminary preparation for the First Prayer Book.

Before three months of the reign of Edward VI had passed, on Easter Monday, April 11, 1547, the first experiment was made, by the singing of Compline in English in the Royal Chapel[1]. The service existed in several versions already in the English Primers[2]: that in Hilsey's *Manual* was closer to the ordinary Sarum service than that in Henry VIII's Primer, and closer also to the Compline of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the older Primers. It would seem likely therefore, for this reason as well as for general reasons, that the service used in the Royal Chapel was connected with the Royal Primer rather than with the service in Hilsey's *Manual*: but there is no direct evidence forthcoming, and nothing is possible but conjecture. It is worth while, however, to notice one small point which, so far as it goes, tells in the same direction. In Hilsey's Primer the hymn at Compline was 'O Lord the world the Saviour,' a version of the *Salvator mundi domine*, such as could hardly be sung to any existing plainsong tune. In Henry's Primer the hymn was 'O Lord the maker of all things,' a version of *Te lucis ante terminum*, which had certainly before this date (1547) been set to music for four voices. The composition has been ascribed either to William Mundy, or, more generally but more doubtfully, to King Henry VIII himself[3]: but in either case it is clear that there was music available for this hymn, and it is not impossible that it was this, which was sung in the Royal Chapel.

---

[1] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 311–394.

Three months later the Royal Injunctions prescribed a new experiment, viz. the reading of the Epistle and Gospel at High Mass in English. The innovation was not a marked one: English New Testaments containing a table of directions to find the Epistles and Gospels had long been in use; besides these the later Primers often contained the Epistles and Gospels in English, and, even if the actual reading at High Mass were an innovation, which is probably not altogether the case, it was at any rate only a small one and did not involve the provision of any new service books.

---

[1] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 58.

[2] The three principal types of reformed primer were Marshall's *Goodly Prymer*, 1535; Hilsey's *Manual of Prayers*, 1539; and King Henry's *Primer*, 1545. The latter was reprinted in the early part of Edward's reign. See these in Burton's *Three Primers*.

[3] Barnard (*Church Music*, 1641) ascribed it to the former, and Boyce (*Cathedral Music* i.) to the latter. It is among the pieces in the Edwardine part-books in the Bodleian Library; see below, p. 245.

There is no need at this point to do more than call attention to the saying of the Litany in English, which was also prescribed by the Injunctions; for Henry VIII had made provision for this in 1544, and the Edwardine forms of the Litany will be noted hereafter. Again, the 'Order of Communion,' the English devotions provided for communicants, to be for the time interpolated in the middle of the Latin Mass, and afterwards incorporated in the Prayer Book, is well known and need only be mentioned as a further step on the road of experiment; but long before this was issued, at the opening Mass of Parliament and Convocation on Nov. 4, 1547, the *Gloria in excelsis*, *Credo*, and *Agnus Dei* were all sung in English[1].

Six months later 'Poule's quire with diuers other parishes in London song all the seruice in English both mattens masse & euensonge,' and at the anniversary of Henry VII kept at Westminster on May 12, 1548, the mass was 'song all in English with the consecration of the sacrament also spoken in English[2].'

The experiments were clearly being continued in the Royal Chapel, and it was even thought wise that they should have a wider recognition. On September 4, 1548, a letter was sent from Somerset to the University of Cambridge ordering them in their 'colleges, chapels, or other churches (to) use one uniform order, rite and ceremonies in the mass, matins, and evensong, and all divine service in the same to be said or sung such as is presently used in the King's Majesty's Chapel'—pending further changes[3]. There is no express mention here of English services, but the Use of the Royal Chapel was clearly an anticipation of the coming Prayer Book.

Five days after the writing of this letter Robert Ferrar was consecrated Bishop of St. David's, and at the Eucharist not only the administration but also the Consecration of the Blessed Sacrament was in English[4].

Such are the brief and scattered notices of the experiments made in English Service preliminary to the First Prayer Book. It is time now to go on and see what documentary evidence of these experimental services has survived.

---

[1] Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, i 187.

[2] Ibid. ii 2.

[3] Gasquet and Bishop, p. 147.

[4] See the Acts of Consecration from Cranmer's Register in Courayer, *Défense*, II. ii, Appendix, p. xxxvii, or Estcourt, *Anglican Ordinations*, Appendix VIII.

There is one MS at the British Museum which bears upon the question of the Mass, as it appeared in English dress previous to the First Prayer Book[1]. It contains the Bass part of a quantity of Latin Church music by composers of the time of Henry VIII, including a motet which embodies a prayer for the King. Then follows in a later hand and in a different style an adaptation of some of the old plainsong to English words, together with the Bass part of the English Litany. Of this and of the English version of the *Te Deum* which follows, it will be better to speak later, and deal first with the adaptation of the Mass. There are no *Kyries* given at the beginning, but only *Gloria in excelsis*, *Credo in unum*, 'Let your light so shine,' *Sanctus*, *Agnus*, and the responses of *Sursum corda.*

It is remarkable that in *Gloria in excelsis* the repetition 'Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us,' occurs, which was inserted in the Second Prayer Book but was not in the First. The last clause runs thus: 'in the glory off the Father.' Otherwise this both in position and in wording agrees with the First Prayer Book. The *Credo* only differs from it in small details[2], but the *Sanctus* runs thus: the italics show the variations from the First Prayer Book, the (2) marks a repetition :—

Holy *art thou*: holy *art thou*: holy *art thou*, Lord God of hosts: hevyn and erth ar full of thy glory. Osanna yn the hyest (2). Blyssyd ys he that cummith yn the name of the Lord. *Osanna* yn the hyest (2).

The *Agnus* is the same as that in the First Prayer Book, and the only other point that calls for notice is that there is no sign of the Response to *Dominus vobiscum* before the *Sursum corda*, but only of the two following responses[3].

---

[1] Brit. Mus. MS 34191.

[2] 'And was crucified for us': 'to judge the quycke': 'which spake by the prophets.'

[3] This plainsong adaptation has been published by J. W. Doran as *Missa Simplex* (St. Mary's Convent, Wantage), but brought into line with the present service, and not in its original shape.

There follow some pages containing Latin Church Music—the Bass part only—similar to the first section of the book, and then again there are some items added in the hand of the second section, viz. the Bass part of a *Gloria in excelsis* and a *Credo in unum*, both in English. These seem to belong to the First Prayer Book[1]. But these do not represent the latest additions: for at the end of the second section there has been added in a third hand a setting of the *Kyrie* for three voices in the well-known form as now used, and distinctive at that date of the Second Prayer Book of 1552.

A set of part-books in the Bodleian Library[2] gives further evidence of versions of the Mass previous to the Prayer Book of 1549. The music contained in them is divided into three books: a great part of it corresponds to the First Prayer Book, and the last entry of all is a single setting of the English *Kyrie*, which evidently was added in 1552 on the appearance of the Second Prayer Book. Neither here nor elsewhere in the volume is there any mention of the name of any composer. The first book contains two Masses, the second three, and the third five.

The second Mass of the first book, the first Mass of the second book, and all except the second of the third book exhibit the text of the First Prayer Book with only some unimportant variations[3]. But there remain four Masses which in the main agree in exhibiting a different version; and this unanimity shows that the variations are not mere freaks, such as may be observed in the settings above mentioned of the text of the First Prayer Book, but that they represent another substantive version.

The most conspicuous variation is that the Apostles' Creed is used instead of the Nicene Creed in all four settings: the text of it is that of the King's Primer[4]: and this suggests that the use of the Apostles' Creed in place of the Nicene Creed was due to the fact that this version of the former was ready to hand while there was none available of the latter[1]. The *Kyrie* and *Agnus* are practically the same as the Prayer Book version, but both *Gloria in excelsis* and *Sanctus* differ.

---

[1] There is no repetition of the first *Qui tollis* in the *Gloria in excelsis*.

[2] Mus. Sch. E. 420–422; the Tenor volume is unfortunately missing.

[3] Such as 'art most hyest,' or 'in the glory off the Father,' or 'Thou only art the Lord Jhesu,' in the *Gloria in excelsis*. The words 'whose kingdom shall have no end' are uniformly omitted from the Creed, as in the First Prayer Book. See Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, p. 106.

[4] Burton, p. 459.

The following is their text: the italics mark the variation from the Prayer Book version :—

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

And *peace on the earthe & unto men of* [*a*] *good wyll:*
We praise the, we *magnyfye* the, we worshype the,
We gloryfye the, we gyve thanks *un*to the for thy grete glorye,
O lord god, heuenly Kyng, God the father *omnipotent*,
O lord the onlye begotton sone Jhesu Chryst.
O Lord God, *the* lambe of God, *the* sone of the father,
Which takest awaye the synes of the world, have mercy upon us;
Which takest awaye the synes of the world, *gracyously receve ower supplycacyons;*
Whych syttyest at the ryght hand of *the father*, have mercy upon us.
For thou only art holy, thou only *art lord*,
Thou only *art hyest O Jhesu Chryst* with the holy goost
Unto the glory of God the father. Amen.

This version is interesting in several respects: it is a simple translation of the Latin *Gloria in excelsis*, evidently made before the Reformers began to exercise their critical skill on the text of the hymn. The first words follow the version in the Bible of the day: later, the reading εὐδοκία was adopted instead of εὐδοκίας, and our version consequently deserted the Latin *hominibus bonae voluntatis.* Two other departures from the Latin which were made eventually do not appear here, viz. (i) At the right hand of *God* the Father: (ii) the omission of the word *Jesu* in the closing phrase. Now that the existence of this version is known it is more difficult than ever to see why these two departures from the text were ever made. No doubt the Revisers had reasons, and probably similar to those which led them to alter the opening sentence: but they do not seem to be discoverable now[2].

The version of the *Sanctus* is similar to that quoted above from the British Museum MS :—

---

[1] In that case the version of the Nicene Creed in Brit. Mus. MS 34191 would necessarily be later.

[2] See Dowden, *op. cit.* p. 79.

Holy *art thou*, Holy *art thou*, Holy *art thou*[1], *O* Lord God of hostes:
Heven & earth are *replenyshed with* thi glory.
Osanna in the hyest (2).
Blessed is he that commethe in the name of the lord:
Osanna in the hyest (2).

In several of the Masses an Offertory and a Postcommunion are given: these agree with the First Prayer Book except that at the end of the first book a postcommunion is added which is not in the Prayer Book of 1549, 'I am the voyce[2].' A further piece 'O Almighty God the Father we give Thee thanks' is provided at the beginning of the second book for use 'After the communion receved,' and there is a setting also of the words 'Christ our Paschal Lamb' which are appointed in the First Prayer Book to be said by the Priest at the end of the Canon.

Besides the Masses the Bodleian part-books contain other liturgical music. The three settings of the Easter anthems *Christus resurgens*[3] anticipate the version of the First Prayer Book, except in having 'Praise ye the Lord' in place of 'Alleluia'; and the music of the Burial service is also practically identical[4]. For a 'Wedynge' there is provided a metrical version of Ps. cxxviii with doxology, and for 'Ashe Wensday' a musical setting of 'Torne thou us good lord[5].'

Coming to the question of Mattins, Evensong, and Litany, it is necessary to take some farther MSS into account besides those that have been so far described. At the British Museum there is another set of Edwardine part-books from the Royal Chapel containing canticles and psalms which are of considerable interest in this connexion[6], while various items of information are to be gathered also from another set of five part-books and two odd part-books[7].

---

[1] In the first Mass of the first book this is 'Holy, Holy, Holy.'

[2] Also at the beginning of the first book, in the Postcommunion, 'Happy are those servants,' the clause 'When he cometh' is omitted.

[3] A setting of this by Batten is in the Peterhouse part-books; see *The Ecclesiologist* for 1859, p. 170.

[4] Note 'of whom seke we' for 'of whom may we seek.'

[5] A setting of these words by Causton is printed in Day's *Morning and Evening Prayer*, &c., 1565 (Bodleian Douce, B. 248), or the earlier edition of 1560 called *Certain Notes*. In the First Prayer Book they are termed 'Antheme.'

[6] Royal Appendix, 74, 75, 76. Triplex, Medius, and Tenor, probably only for one side of the choir.

[7] Brit. Mus. 30480-4, 22597, and Harl. 7578.

Three versions are found of the *Venite*: the one in the Harleian part-book is quite unlike any of the Primers[1], and differs only in five or six places from the Prayer Book Version thus:—

O come let us worshippe & fall down ourselves . . . For he is our God . . . This daye . . . As when ye provoked in time of temtacion . . . They err as in their harts, theie verelie have not . . . Wherefore I swear unto them . . .

One of the versions given in the Bodleian books is substantially the same as this: it is not at all clear so far from what source these two versions are derived. The third version, which is also given in the Bodleian books, is altogether different, being practically the same as the version contained both in Hilsey's *Manual* and also in the King's Primer[2]: it will be seen from the text printed here, with footnotes calling attention to the variations of the text printed in the Primers, that two unimportant words are added, and the supposititious clause of the Primers, *quoniam non repellit dominus plebem suam*, is omitted. The other omissions were only due to the musical exigencies of the Bass part of the setting, and were supplied by the other voices:—

Come and let vs reioyce vnto y^{e} Lord[3]. Let vs come before hys face $\overset{t}{\mathrm{w}}$ confessyon and thankes gyvyng, and syng we Ioyfullye to hym in psalmes. For god ys a grete Lord, and a grete kyng ouer all godes[4]: in whose powr are all y^{e} coastes of y^{e} earthe, and he beholdethe y^{e} toppes of y^{e} mountayns. The sea ys hys, for he hathe made yt, and hys hand hathe fashonede y^{e} earthe also: come therfore and let vs worshype and fall down before god, Let vs wepe before y^{e} Lord who hathe made vs, for he is our Lord god and we are hys people and y^{e} shepe of his pasture[5]. Se $\overset{t}{\mathrm{y}}$ ye harden not your hartes[6] in tyme of temtacyon in wyldernes, where your fathers temptede me [and] provede me and sawe my workes. Fortye years was I grevede $\overset{t}{\mathrm{w}}$ thys generacyon and I sayd euer, y^{e} erre in ther hartes[7]: $\overset{t}{\mathrm{y}}$ y^{e} shulde not enter (2) into my rest. Glorye [be] to y^{e} father and to y^{e} sone and to y^{e} hollye goost, as yt was in yᵉ begynyng, and ys nowe, and euer shalbe, world wᵗout end. Amen[1].

---

[1] In Burton's reprint of the *Three Primers* many of the common forms are not printed out in full in each case, even though they exhibit in some cases great differences of text or are even entirely different versions of the same original.

[2] The full text is not printed in Burton.

[3] *The two Primers add*, let us ioyfully sing to God our saviour.

[4] *Add*, whyche doth not forsake his people.

[5] *Add*, Today if ye hear his voyce.

[6] *Add*, as in the bitter murmuring.

[7] *Add*, they have not knowen my wayes: to whom I swore in myne angre.

The following is the version of the *Te Deum* given in the Royal part-books; it is substantially, though not verbatim, that of the Primer of 1535, called Marshall's Primer[2], and not that of the King's Primer which agrees with the First Prayer Book. It is printed here with notes, showing how far some of the same peculiarities are found in the Harleian part-book, which has a text intermediate between this and the Prayer Book text. The passages bracketed are those in which the Harleian text agrees with the Prayer Book; the italics show what is different from the Prayer Book text[3].

We praise the O God; we knowledge the to be the lord.
All the erth [*might*] worship the, *which art* the father everlasting.
To the [*crye forth all angels*], the heavens & all the powrs therin:
To the *thus cryeth* cherubin and seraphin contynually:
Holy *art thou* (iij); *Thou art the* Lord God of *hosts:*
Heaven and erth ar [*fulfilled with the glorye of thy maiestie.*]
The glorious company of th' apostels praise the:
The goodly felowship of the prophets *worship* the:
The *faire felowship of the* martirs praise the[4]:
The holy [*congregacion of the faithful thorow* all the world *magnifie* the,
They knowledge the to be] the father of an infinite maiestie,
They[5] *knowledge* thy honorable [*and verie*] only sone,
They[5] *knowledge* the holie gost *to be a* comforter.
Thou art the king of glorie O Christ:
Thou art theverlasting sone of the father.
Thou when thou [*shouldst take*] upon the [*our nature*] to delyuer
    man didst not abhorre the virgin's wombe.
[*Thou hast now*] *openyd* the kyngdome of heuyn to [*the*] beleuers
    [*death's dart ouercom*]*:*
Thou sittest on the right hand of god in the glorie of the father:

---

[1] Bodl. Mus. Sch. E. 422, f. 77.

[2] See Burton's *Three Primers*, p. 82.

[3] In Hilsey's Primer the version of the *Te Deum* is similar to Marshall's, while the curious Grafton *Primer* of 1540, which is in the main a cross between Marshall and Hilsey, gives here yet another version of *Te Deum*, intermediate between Marshall's and the later version; but not the same as the Harleian version. The version in Roger Car's *Psalter and Litany* of 1548 is different again in a few points. (Brit. Mus. C. 25. b. 2.)

[4] *Harl.* The felowship of the blessed martirs praise & magnify Thee.

[5] *Harl.* We.

[*Thou art bilieuyd to come*] our iudge.
Wherfore we pray the help thy seruants, whom thou hast redemyd
wt thy precious blood:
Make [*me then*][1] nombrid wt thy saincts in [*ioy*] euerlasting.
O Lord saue thy people & blesse theine heritage.
Gouerne them [*also*] and lift them up for euer.
[*We praise the euery day*,]
And we worship thy name euer[2] world without end.
[3]*O lord let it be thy pleasure*[3] to kepe us this daye without syn.
O lord have mercy on us, [*O lord*] haue mercy on us.
O lord let thy mercy [*light on*] us *euen as we*[4] *now do*[4] trust in the.
[5]O lord *I trust in the* (2)[5]: let me[6] neuer be confounded (2).

Other versions in the main anticipate the Prayer Book, or, in other words, follow the King's Primer, but 'Holy art thou' appears in some[7] and 'which art the father everlasting' in others[8]. Some have 'heaven & earth are replenished with' thy glory, and 'The Holy Gost also being the Comforter,' which are forms printed in some editions of the Prayer Book[9].

Here then, again, there are two distinct versions, that of Marshall's or Hilsey's Primer, and that of the Royal Primer and of the Prayer Book, and it seems likely that the former was in use in experimental services preliminary to the Prayer Book.

The *Benedicite* appears in the Royal part-books in this form, set for two alternating choirs, and in the Bodleian part-books it is almost identical. The version comes from the King's Primer; that in Marshall's and that in Hilsey's Primer are quite different, though mainly agreeing together. In the Prayer Book the old form of the Canticle was deserted in favour of the full scriptural text with the refrain repeated after every address, and *Gloria patri* was appended as the doxology in place of *Benedicamus*.

Prayse ye the lorde, all the works of the lorde,
prayse & exalte[10] hym for euer.
The Angelles of the lorde, prayse ye the lorde,
Ye heauens prayse [ye] the lorde.

---

[1] Probably miswritten, for the Primer has here the same as the Prayer Book.
[2] *Harl.* for ever.
[3] *Harl.* We beseech thee O lord.
[4] *Harl.* put our.
[5] *Harl.* In thee O lord we trust.
[6] *Harl.* us.
[7] Brit. Mus. 34191 and Bodleian.
[8] Brit. Mus. 29289, f. 1, and a setting by Thomas Causton in 38226, f. 63.
[9] Note also that 34191 has 'And we worship thy holy name.'
[10] *Bodl.* has 'extol' throughout.

Ye waters, all that are above heauen, prayse the lorde,
All the powers of the lorde, prayse ye the lorde.
    The sonne & mone, prayse ye the lorde.
    Sterres of the firmament, prayse ye the lorde.
The rayne & the dewe, prayse ye the lorde.
All ye[1] wyndes of god, prayse ye the lorde.
    Fire & heate, prayse ye the lorde.
    Winter & somer, prayse ye the lorde.
Dewes & hore frosts, prayse ye the lorde.
Frost & colde, prayse ye the lorde.
    Yse & snow, prayse ye the lorde.
    Nyghtes & dayes, prayse ye the lorde.
Light & darnes, prayse ye the lorde.
Lightnyng & clowds, prayse ye the lorde.
    The earthe prayse the lorde,
    lawde & exalte hym for euer[more.]
Mountaynes & hills, prayse ye the lorde.
All that spryngs[2] upon the earth, prayse ye the lorde.
    Ye welles & spryngs, prayse ye the lorde,
    Seeas & fluddes, prayse ye the lorde.
Grete fishes & all that moue in the waters, prayse ye the lorde.
All byrdes of the ayre, prayse ye the lorde.
    All beastes & cattell, prayse ye the lorde.
    Ye children of men, praise the lorde.
Let Israell prayse the lorde,
Laude hym & exalte hym for euermore.
    Ye prestes of the lorde, prayse [ye] the lorde.
    Ye seruants of the lorde, prayse [ye] the lorde.
Ye spirits & soules of rightuse men, praise [ye] the lorde.
Ye holy & meke in hart, praise [ye] the lorde.
    Anania azaria mysaell, prayse ye the lorde,
    lawde & exalte hym for euermore.
Blesse we the father the sonne & the holy ghost,
Prayse we hym & exalte hym for euermore.
(*full*) Blessid art thou, lorde, in the fyrmament of heauin,
    Thow arte prayseworthie, gloryous and exallted,
        worlde wythe oute end. Amen[3].

The *Benedictus* everywhere agrees with the First Prayer Book, which has the same version as the Primer of 1545. In Hilsey's Primer of 1539, and Marshall's Primer of 1535, there are other versions.

---

[1] *Or* the.

[2] *Primer* springeth.

[3] A setting by Farrant, for men, somewhat similar is in Brit. Mus. 29289, f. 99^{v}. Only one part-book exists, and it contains only some of the verses; but it has *Gloria patri* and not *Benedicamus*. The same is the case with the Bodleian part-books.

The *Magnificat* is used in several forms: the first is that of Marshall's Primer, which appears almost verbatim in the Royal part-books.

My soule magnifithe the lorde, & my sprite reioyith in god my sauior.
For he hath lookt on the poore degre of his handmayden.
Behold now from henseforth all generacions shall call me blessed:
For he that is mightie hath magnifide me; wherefore [O] blessid be his name.
And his mercy is ouer them that feare him thorow all generacions.
He shewth strength wt his arme, he skattreth [all] them that are prowde in thymaginacion of ther harts:
He hath pluckt down men of power from ther seats, & hath liftid up the poore lowlyons.
The hungry men he hath satisfide with [his] goodnes: and them tht appered riche he hath left voide:
He hath taken up Israel his seruant, thinking upon him [for] to be sauid for his mercyes sake,
Like as he promest to or fathers, as to Abraham and to his seede for euermore.
Glory be to the father, to the sone & to the holy gost:
[Evyn] as it was in the beginning, as it is now & euer shalbe. So be it [always. So be it][1].

The version in the King's Primer is that used in the First Prayer Book; Hilsey's is intermediate between the two.

The Bodleian part-books give three settings different from that of the Prayer Book: two of these are in the main identical with it and with the King's Primer[2], but the third varies considerably, and is closer to Hilsey's version than to any other.

---

[1] See Burton's *Three Primers*, p. 109. Marshall has 'Shall all generations,' 'throughout all generations,' and omits the bracketed words.

[2] The setting on f. 6v shows the following variations:—

For behold from henceforth shall all generacions . . . hath done grete thyngs. And hys mercy endurethe throwghout all generacyons. . . . He shewed strength with hys arme & scaterethe . . . He puttethe down . . . & exalteth them of lowe degree. He fylleth . . . & letteth the ryche go emtye. He remembrethe mercy & helpeth up hys servant Israell, even as he promised unto our father abraham & to hys seed for ever. Glory to the.

The setting on f. 90 has 'the humillitye of his handmaiden,' 'seat,' 'Glory be to,' 'and is now.'

My soule dothe magnifye the lord: & my spret reioysethe[1] in god my savyour.
For he hath loked upon the lowe degre of hys hand mayden:
Beholde from henceforthe shal all generacyons call me blessed:
Because he that ys myghtye hathe done to me greate thyngs, and holly ys hys name.
And hys mercy ys on them that feare him from generacyon to generacyon.
He hath shewed streyngth with hys arme, he hathe scatered them that are proude in the Imaginacyons of ther hartes.
He hathe put down the myghtye from there seates & hathe exalted them of lowe degre.
He hath fylled the hongry with good thyngs, & sent away the ryche emtye.
He hath holpen hys servant Israell in remembrannce of hys mercy,
Even as he promysed to ower father abraham and to hys seed for ever.
Glory to the father and to the sone & to the holly goost,
As it was in the begynnyng ys now, & ever shalbe, world without end. Amen[2].

The *Nunc dimittis* in every case but one keeps fairly close to the Prayer Book version, which, though varying in different editions, is in the main the same as that of the King's Primer. However, the first setting in the Bodleian part-books gives a quite different text, which seems to be also unlike that of either Marshall's or Hilsey's Primer, though it has points of agreement with each of them.

Lord, let thi servant now depart in peace, according to thi promys:
For myne eyes have seen thi savyour, sent from the;
Whom thou hast prepared before the face of the people:
A lyght to lyghten the gentyles to be the glory of thy people Israel.
Glory to . . .
As it was in the begynnyng, as ys now & ever shalbe, world without end. Amen. So be it (2).

There are several settings of the Litany, but none follow either the Litany of 1544, or that in the Primer of 1545, or that in Car's Psalter and Litany of 1548, in having the three invocations of the Blessed Virgin, the angels &c., the patriarchs &c., nor in having 'suffer us not to be led into temptacion' at the end of the Lord's Prayer[1]. Many cases, however, occur of the alternative rendering 'let us not be led into temptacion[2].' In some cases this is joined with further variation in the version; thus in the Royal part-books the Lord's Prayer has at the beginning 'O our Father,' and at the end 'But delyuer us from all euil'; and although forming part of the Litany it also has the full doxology, 'for thine is the kingdom & the power & the glory for ever. So be it.' The Litany then inverts the present order of the two forms of 'O lord arise,' and further it gives instead of Amen 'Always so be it,' once as the end of the *Gloria*, and six times more; no doubt these six repetitions are meant for use at the end of the six prayers which closed the Litany of 1544 or 1545, but were not all appended to the Litany in the First Prayer Book. This Litany thus represents an intermediate stage between the Psalter of 1548 and the Prayer Book of 1549.

---

[1] This reading is common even in the texts which follow the Prayer Book.
[2] f. 4^{v}.

The Bodleian part-books give (at f. 58^v of Mus. Sch. E. 422) another version altogether of the Lord's Prayer, but throw no fresh light on the Litany.

> Our Father . . . Thy name be hallowede.
> Thy kingdom come unto us, thi wylle be done & fulfilled . . .
> And let us not . . . from all euil. Amen.

Both the Royal and the Bodleian part-books contain a number of other settings, anthems, metrical psalms, &c. The former has also four psalms set to the Tones in a harmonized form with the Plain-song in the tenor[3], and five psalms set anthem-wise. They are all followed by the *Gloria*, except two which end simply with 'So be it,' and one with 'Amen,' but the version of it which is given in two cases is an unusual one; the three bracketed words are only there in one case, and the first two are insertions in a later hand.

> Glory be to the Father, [to] the sone, and [to] the holy gost,
> [Even] As it was in the beginning, as it is now & ever shalbe.
> So be it.

---

[1] The Litany in Brit. Mus. MS. 34191 stops before the Lord's Prayer.

[2] Bodl. Mus. Sch. E. 422 ff. 58, 59, 82^v. Royal Appendix, 76 p. 2. And cp. Brit. Mus. 22597 and 30483.

[3] To the Tones II, V 1, VII (signed Johnson), VIII 1. Considerable liberty is taken with the canto fermo.

Other versions of the *Gloria patri* have already been given above with the canticles: in one case, that of the Magnificat in the Royal part-books, the version was that common to Marshall's and Hilsey's books: in other cases the version was that of the King's Primer, and in other cases that of the First Prayer Book: while the two versions last given belong to none of these three clear types. Here then the greatest diversity is traceable[1].

Among the other pieces contained in these part-books are a number of metrical psalms not drawn from Sternhold's collection (first published in 1549), but probably from some earlier source[2]; these are of interest, and would probably contribute something to the solution of the problem which besets the history of the early metrical psalms, but they are alien to the present purpose, and all that can now be done is to append a rough alphabetical list of the different items, other than those above mentioned, which are found in the Royal and the Bodleian part-books.

It was not to be expected that such sources would give new evidence as to some features of the experimental stage, about which news would be specially welcome, e. g. the Eucharistic Canon or 'the consecration of the sacrament' mentioned by Wriothesley[3]. But they have preserved some interesting links, and established more clearly the connexion between the Primers and the Prayer Book; and also, in testifying to the use of the Apostles' Creed at the Eucharist, they have rescued from oblivion an unexpected and important fact.

W. H. FRERE.

AN INDEX OF THE FURTHER CONTENTS OF THE ROYAL AND THE BODLEIAN PART-BOOKS.

ROYAL APPENDIX, 74, 75, 76[4].

All men rejoice. Metrical Version of *Iubilate deo* (Ps. c).
Behold bretherne. *Ecce quam bonum.* Psalm set to seventh Tone.
Benedicite. Praise ye the Lord. Metrical version.

---

[1] See Dowden, *Workmanship*, p. 166.

[2] Others are in Harl. 7578, Add. 15166, 30480-4, 22597.

[3] Above, p. 231.

[4] The items are indexed by their Latin titles, where these are given, as well as by their first words.

Benedictus. Praysid be th' Almightie Lord. Metrical version.
Celi enarrant. The heauens in ther excellence. Metrical psalm.
De profundis. Out of the deep. Psalm set to second Tone.
Deus in nomine tuo. Save me O God. Anthem.
Deus misereatur nostri. O God be mercifull unto us. Anthem.
Domine dominus noster. O Lorde our lorde how marvellous. Metrical psalm.
Domine quis. O Lord whom wilt thou. Metrical psalm.
Ecce quam bonum. Behold bretherne. Psalm set to seventh Tone.
Geue sentence with me O God. *Iudica me.* Psalm set to eighth Tone.
How long O Lord wilt me forget? Metrical version of *Usquequo domine?* (Ps. xiii).
I cryde unto the Lord. *Voce mea.* Anthem.
Iubilate deo. All men reioice. Metrical psalm.
Iudica me deus. Geue sentence with me O God. Psalm set to eighth Tone.
Laudate pueri dominum. Praise the Lord ye servants. Psalm set to fifth Tone.
Ne reminiscaris. Remembre not O Lord. Anthem, not psalm.
Non nobis domine. Not unto us. Anthem.
Not unto us. *Non nobis domine.* Anthem.
O clappe your hands. *Omnes gentes.* Psalm set anthemwise.
O God be mercifull unto us. *Deus misereatur nostri.* Anthem.
O Lord Christ Jesu that art king in glory. Anthem with prayer for Edward VI.
O Lorde, our lorde, how marvellous. Metrical version of *Domine dominus noster* (Ps. ix).
O Lord rebuke me not in thy fury. Psalm set anthemwise with *Gloria.*
O Lord whom wilt thou count worthie. Metrical version of *Domine quis* (xv).
Omnes gentes. O clappe your hands. Psalm set anthemwise.
Out of the deep. *De profundis.* Psalm set to second Tone.
Praise the Lord ye servants. *Laudate pueri dominum.* Psalm set to fifth Tone.
Praise ye the Lord. Metrical version of *Benedicite.*
Praysid be God our Father. Anthem.
Praysid be th' Almightie Lord. Metrical version of *Benedictus.*
Remembre not O Lord. *Ne reminiscaris.* Anthem, not psalm.
Save me O God. *Deus in nomine tuo.* Anthem.
The heauens in ther excellence. Metrical version of *Celi enarrant* (Ps. xix).

Usquequo domine? How long O Lord wilt me forget? Metrical psalm.
Voce mea. I cryde unto the Lord. Anthem.

BODLEIAN. MUS. SCH. E. 420–422[1].

ii. All people hearken & give ear (Metrical).
i. Blessed art thou that feareth God. *Metrical psalm & doxology at a Wedynge.*
i. *Deus in adjutorium.* Haste thee O Lord.
i. *Domine secundum actum.* In judgment Lord.
i. Happy is the people. *Antem.*
i. Haste thee O Lord (*Deus in adjutorium*).
i. Hear the voyce and prayer. ? Tallis in Day's *Certain Notes*[2].
i. How long wilt thou forgete me? (*Usquequo domine?*).
i. I am the trewe vyne. *Antem.*
iii. If a man saye. *Antem.*
ii. If ye love me. ? Tallis in Day's *Certain Notes.*
i. I give you a new commandment. *Antem.* ? Sheppard or Johnson in Day's *Certain Notes.*
iii. I have set my hope.
i. In judgment Lord. (*Domine secundum.*) (Metrical.) Cp. Brit. Mus. MS. 30480.
i. In no kind of creature. *Antem.*
ii. Let all the congregation. (Metrical)[3]: in Day's *Certain Notes.*
i. Lord Jesu Christ son of the living God. i. e. the collect *Domine Jesu Christe fili dei vivi.*
i. Make ye melody. *Antem.*
iii. O almighty God the Father we give the thanks. *After the Communion received.*
ii. O clap your hands.
ii. O eternal God almighty.
ii. [O God be merciful unto us] and bless us.
iii. O God in whose hand[3].
iii. O Lord of hosts. *Antem.*
ii. O Lord the maker of all thing. i. e. Hymn *Te lucis ante terminum.*
i. O most merciful Jesu Christ. *Antem*[3].
i. O praise ye the Lord. *Antem.*
ii. Praise be to God (3). Come thou Holy Ghost fulfil, i.e. the Antiphon, *Veni sancte spiritus.*
iii. Praise the Lord. *Antem.*

---

[1] The Roman numerals refer to the three books into which the collection is divided. See above, p. 233.

[2] See above, p. 235, note 5.

[3] This contains a prayer for Edward VI.

i. Praise we the Father. In Day's *Certain Notes.*
ii. Praise ye the Lord our soules.
ii. Remember not O Lord God our old iniquities. i. e. *Ne reminiscaris.* Set by Tallis in Day's *Certain Notes.*
i. Submyte yourselves. *Antem.* (? Sheppard.)
ii. The sprete of the Lord hath replenished. i. e. Ant. *Spiritus domini* with Psalm Verse lxviii. 1. & *Gloria.*
i. This is my commandment. *Antem.*
i. *Usquequo domine?* How long wilt thou forgete me?
ii. Verely verely I say unto you Except ye eat.
iii. Walke while ye have. *Antem.*

DOCUMENTS

THE SACRAMENTARY OF SERAPION OF THMUIS.

II. The Order of Baptism.

The fundamental identity of baptismal offices is, if possible, even more obvious than that of liturgies; and Serapion's rite conforms to the common type. Its chief value lies in this, that it defines the fourth-century usage, the evidence for which is otherwise for the most part either fragmentary, as in the incidental allusions of ecclesiastical writers, or in the shape of general descriptions, as in the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. In particular it supplements and focuses the fragmentary notices of Egyptian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and combines them into a whole which is obviously the parent of the existing Egyptian rite. It is for Egypt what *Ap. Constt.* vii 39–45 is for Syria; only it is in some respects more definite and satisfactory.

Serapion's rite is contained in the prayers numbered 7–11, 15, 16, the two last being the prayers of anointing (ἄλειψις) before baptism and of the unction (χρίσμα) of confirmation. The only question of arrangement is as to where these two are to be inserted in the series 7–11. If my emendation of the title of 10 is accepted, it is clear that 15 is to be inserted between 9 and 10; and in any case a comparison with almost any Eastern rite shows that it must be placed either immediately before or immediately after 10. As to 11, its title seems to require that it immediately follow the act of baptism, and consequently that the prayer of confirmation (16) stand last: and I have adopted this order. But it remains possible that 11 is intended to conclude the whole rite.

A baptismal office consists normally of three parts: (1) the preparation of the catechumen, implying the consecration of the oil, and forming the last stage of the discipline of the catechumenate; (2) the act of baptism, implying the consecration of the water; and (3) the confirmation, implying the consecration of the chrism. In existing rites one or more of the several consecrations of the matters are detached from the baptismal office and celebrated apart; but the consecration of the font retains its place in the office in all Eastern rites; in other words, the water is not reserved. And when baptisms were ordinarily pontifical rites, celebrated only at Easter, the three consecrations were moments in a more or less continuous series of ceremonies.

1. The *Consecration of the Water* (7) is placed first. In the current Egyptian rites, Coptic and Ethiopic, as in the Syrian (and this already in *Ap. Constt.* vii 43) and the Armenian, it follows the anointing; while in the Byzantine and the Nestorian the water and the oil are consecrated together before the anointing. On the other hand in the *Egyptian Church Order* (can. 46), which herein follows the *Canons of Hippolytus* xix, the preparation of the water stands first. And it seems clear that the Egyptian practice has been changed, in or after the fifth century. For the eighth of the second series of *Canonical Responses* attributed to Timothy of Alexandria[1] is in answer to the question, what a solitary presbyter is to do when called upon to baptize—whether he is first to consecrate the font and then to receive the catechumen's renunciation and anoint him; or to receive the renunciation and then to consecrate the font; or again to baptize the catechumen immediately after the consecration, without going out to receive the renunciation; and the answer is that he is first to receive the renunciation and then to go in and consecrate the water and administer the baptism. It is quite evident that, at the date of this response, the first alternative was the usual practice; i.e. the consecration of the font came first. In the *Church Order* and in the Egyptian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries the allusions to the consecration are quite general, except in so far as St. Didymus (*de Trin.* ii 14) implies that the water was signed with the cross. In Serapion (as in *Ap. Constt.* vii 43) the form is a simple prayer, whereas in the later Egyptian rite it has been assimilated to the mass and developed into a complete 'liturgy of baptism' (Assemani *Cod. lit.* ii pp. 150 sqq.; Denzinger *Rit. or.* i pp. 201 sqq., 236 sqq., 225 sqq.). But Serapion's prayer is quite normal in containing an invocation of the Holy Ghost, a commemoration of the sanctification of the Jordan by our Lord's baptism, and petitions for the regenerating effect in the baptized. It is peculiar, like the consecration of the mass, in containing an invocation also of the Word.

2. The *preparation of the catechumen* is covered by nos. 8, 9, 15, 10. It is clear from the terms of the question and response mentioned in the last paragraph (ἐξιών, προεισελθών), that this part of the rite did not take place in the baptistery itself, but in the vestibule (cp. Cyr. Hier. *Cat. myst.* i 2). Since in the case of adults this preparation was only the conclusion of a prolonged course of instruction and discipline (cp. Origen *c. Cels.* iii 51; *Eg. Ch. Ord.* can. 45), even in the case of

---

[1] Pitra *Juris eccl. graec. hist. et mon.* i p. 640. This series cannot be authentic, since the eighteenth response deals with Christmas, which was not observed in Egypt till about 430 (Duchesne *Origines du culte chrétien* p. 248, ed. 1). But it is Egyptian, and probably not later than of the fifth century. I quote the first series (Pitra *op. cit.* pp. 630 sqq.; Migne *P. G.* xxxiii 1296 sqq.) as 'Tim. Al. *Resp.*', the second as '[Tim. Al.] *Resp.*'

children, who were baptized on the seventh day, it is still described by κατηχεῖσθαι ([Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 4). It consists normally of the exorcism, the renunciation and confession, and the anointing.

a. The exorcism of the baptismal rite is only the conclusion of a series of exorcisms extended over the catechumenate, or at least over the last stage of it (Cyr. Hier. *Procat.* 9, 14, *Cat.* i 5, xvi 19). And a reference to this can be discerned in Serapion's prayer ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων in the mass (21, p. 100[1]), where the reference to 'the mighty hand' of God 'under' which the catechumens have come and to the conquest of Satan and his wiles seems certainly to include an allusion to the exorcisms, which were performed by imposition of hands and invocation (Origen *hom.* xxiv *in Jesu Nave* 1 [ii 453]). In accordance with his scope, we cannot expect to find a formula of exorcism in Serapion's baptismal Order. In the present Egyptian Order (Assemani *C. L.* i 157; Denzinger *R. O.* i 198, 223) the formula, which is accompanied by imposition of hands, is short and unemphatic, as compared with those of the Syrian, Byzantine and Western rites; but this simplicity and the threefold repetition of 'in the name of the onlybegotten' answers to Origen's description of the exorcisms of his day as simple in character and as performed in the holy Name (*c. Cels.* i 6, vii 4). The prayer ὑπὲρ τῶν βαπτιζομένων (8) so far may refer to the exorcism that it contains a petition that the catechumen be 'no more led by ought sinister.' It corresponds in drift with the prayer which precedes the exorcism in the present Egyptian rite (Assemani i 155; Denzinger i 197, 223), while it obviously also points on to the renunciation and confession.

b. The renunciation (ἀποταγή), alluded to in the title of no. 9, follows. It was the function of the deacons 'to prepare the catechumens to make the renunciation' (παρασκευάζειν τοὺς κατηχουμένους ἀποτάξασθαι [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 10), where the allusion is clearly to the undressing and the adjustment of the catechumens' attitudes, facing the west and outstretching the right hand (Assemani i 157; Denzinger i 198, 223: cp. Cyr. Hier. *Cat. myst.* i 4). The form of renunciation in the *Church Order* (can. 46) is 'I renounce thee Satan and all thy service and all thy works,' which so far as it goes agrees with the present Egyptian form (*u. s.*). If the catechumen could not make the renunciation for himself, it was done by his sponsor (ἀνάδοχος [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 3; St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii [iv 683]; *Eg. Ch. Ord.* can. 46).

As is obvious from the substance of the prayer (9), both the confession of faith (συνταγή, σύνταξις, ὁμολογία) and the renunciation is included in the expression ἀποταγή in its title; as is clearly the case also in [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 8. This confession was a triple 'I believe' (St. Cyr.

---

[1] This and similar references are to the first part of the present edition of Serapion's Sacramentary, Journal of Theological Studies, Oct. 1899, pp. 88–113.

Al. *in Jo.* vii) in response to a triple question (St. Dion. Al. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii 9; St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14; St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* xii 1), as approximately in the present Egyptian rite. The catechumen meanwhile, having no doubt turned to the East, stretches forth his hands (St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14). If the *de Trinitate et Spiritu sancto* is the work of St. Athanasius, we have evidence that the form to which assent was given in the fourth century was 'I believe in God the Father almighty and in Jesus Christ his onlybegotten Son and in the Holy Ghost' (c. 7); and in considering the question of the authorship of the work it ought to be taken into account that this formula, so far as it goes (and the further clauses would be irrelevant to the author's purpose), is closely akin to that of the present Egyptian rite: 'I believe in one God the Father almighty and in Jesus Christ his onlybegotten Son our Lord and in the Holy Ghost the giver of life, the resurrection of the flesh and his one only catholic apostolic Church' (Assemani i 159; Denzinger i 198, 223). In the *Egyptian Church Order* (c. 46) there are two confessions, a short one like the above before the baptism, and a developed creed during the immersion. If the Athanasian form is authentic, it represents the short creed, while the longer form may be what St. Cyril of Alexandria alludes to (*in Rom.* vi 3), when he implies that the confession included the death and burial and resurrection of our Lord. The Syrian rites (including those of *Ap. Constt.* vii 41 and St. Chrys. *hom.* xl *in* 1 *Cor.* 1, 2), the Byzantine and the Armenian, all have a complete creed at this point; while the existing Egyptian rite, Coptic and Ethiopic, reserves the recitation of the full creed for 'the liturgy of baptism' in which the font is consecrated (Assemani ii 162; Denzinger i 198 not., 226). If the *Church Order* may be taken as evidence for the recitation of a full creed in the baptisms of the fourth century in Egypt, we may collect a form out of Serapion's prayers, which may approximately represent it.

1. Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν ἀγένητον Πατέρα παντοκράτορα (1, 9, 13, 27)
   οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ πάντων ποιητήν (23, 9).
2. καὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (1)
   τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ Λόγον (1, 8, 10)
   τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα (1, 20).
3. τὸν καταβάντα (7)
   ἐπιδημήσαντα (7)
4. παθόντα (5)
   σταυρωθέντα (5, 17)

. . . .

5. ἀναστάντα (5, 17)
6. . . . .
   καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ ἀγενήτου (5)
7. καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς (17).
8. καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα (8, 10, 16).
9. καὶ μίαν ἁγίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν (1, 23).
10. ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (1, 15, 17).
11. ἀνάστασιν [νεκρῶν] (18).
12. ζωὴν [αἰώνιον] (16).

The words in spaced type are verified either by the Letter of St. Alexander (ap. Thdt. *H. E.* i 4) or by the *Expositio fidei* of St. Athanasius or by the Creed of Macarius (*Acta S. Macarii* in Migne *P. G.* xxxiv 212).

The prayer *after the renunciation* (9) alludes both to the confession (συγκατάθεσις) and to the renunciation, and in its drift quite corresponds with the prayer in the like position in the existing Coptic office (Assemani i 160; Denzinger i 199).

c. In the West a preliminary unction with oil at the time of baptism seems to have been exclusively Roman until the sixth century, when it begins to appear in the Gallican rites. But in the East it is found in *Recog. Clem.* iii 67 and in the fourth-century Syrian writers, St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. myst.* ii 3) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii 42); in St. Chrysostom at Constantinople (*hom.* vi *in Col.* 4); and in Egypt (Clem. Al. *Excerpt.* 82, unless this is the oil of the sick; St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 6 § 23; St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii p. 683 E). And there is evidence of an unction or unctions earlier in the course of the catechumenate in the West, even in Africa and the Gauls; and the double unction with oil in the existing Syrian, Nestorian and Coptic baptismal rites seems to imply the same for the East. In fact the line of demarcation between the catechumenate and the baptismal office seems, as it were, to have been drawn at different points in the several rites: the African and Gallican drew the line after the unctions, the Roman between the earlier and the last, and the Eastern rites just mentioned before the last two. In Serapion, as in the Egyptian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, only one preliminary unction seems to be included in the baptismal rite. In the *Egyptian Church Order* the oil is consecrated at the beginning of the office; and in the present Coptic rite, as in the Roman, it is consecrated along with the chrism on Maundy Thursday (Denzinger i 249 sq.). And the same is perhaps implied in Serapion: the prayer εἰς τὸ ἄλειμμα (15) can scarcely be its consecration; while in the mass provision is made for the consecration of oils, which may mark the custom of consecrating at that point other oil than that actually referred to in the prayer (5). In the Egyptian rite the oil is administered with a simple formula in the first person, but this is preceded and followed by prayers which may be regarded as belonging to the 'form' and correspond in general scope with Serapion's prayer (Assemani i 162 sqq., Denzinger i 199 sq., 224). It may be noted that these prayers are of the nature of prayers of exorcism and so correspond with the title 'oil of exorcism' given to this oil in the *Church Order* (cp. St. Cyr. Hier. *Cat. myst.* ii 3). From St. Cyril of Alexandria (*u. s.*) it appears that the anointing was confirmed by the catechumen or his sponsors with an *Amen*; and the deacon still says *Amen* after the application of the oil (Assemani and Denzinger, *u. s.*).

The next of Serapion's prayers (10) is labelled in the MS *μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν*. In the text below, the emendation *ἄλειψιν* for *ἀνάληψιν* has been adopted. If this be not accepted, the only meaning I can suggest is the 'assumption' of the catechumen into the baptistery, i.e. the prayer follows the passage from the vestibule to the font. But in any case it clearly marks the transition from the preparation of the catechumen to the administration of the baptism; and in scope it corresponds to the Byzantine prayer *Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν προσκάλεσαι* (Assemani i 119), which has been adopted into the Egyptian rite at the opening of 'the liturgy of baptism' within the baptistery (*ib.* ii 151; Denzinger i 201, 225). A prayer or prayers intervening between the anointing and the baptism is an Egyptian characteristic, which is thus reproduced by Serapion.

3. The *Baptism.* The catechumens have now passed into the baptistery (*τὸ ἅγιον βαπτιστήριον* St. Ath. *Encycl.* 2) and they are there presented (*ἐπιδιδόναι*) and their names proclaimed by the deacon, or in his absence by a subdeacon or a reader ([Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 11). The priest immerses each three times (St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 12) in the font (*ἡ κολυμβήθρα ib.* ii 6 § 4, ii 14 &c.), with the formula Βαπτίζω σε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (Tim. Al. *Resp.* 28), as in the existing Egyptian rite (Assemani ii 180; Denzinger i 208, 230). The coincidence of the form with the Western form will be noted. The neophytes 'ascend' from the font, and if the title of the next prayer (11) is to be taken quite strictly, that prayer is recited. But there is nothing in the existing rite quite corresponding to such a prayer in this position, and its drift, with its reference to the divine gift (*ἡ θεία δωρεά*), makes it quite possible that it follows confirmation and concludes the whole rite.

4. From incidental allusions it may be gathered that *Confirmation* in Egypt consisted in, probably an imposition of hands (Orig. *de princip.* i 3 §§ 2, 7; St. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 6), and certainly an unction (Orig. *in Lev.* vi 5, *in Rom.* v 8; St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 6 § 23), administered by the bishop with consecrated chrism in the form of a cross, on the forehead of the neophyte, 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' (St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14 sq.; as in the existing rite, Assemani iii 83 sq.; Denzinger i 209, 231), to which the neophyte or his sponsor answered 'Amen' (Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii p. 683). In 'Ambrosiaster' *Quaestt. in vet. et nov. test.* 101 and *in ep. Eph.* iv 12 we find it noted, as a characteristic of Egypt, that in the absence of the bishop the presbyters confirmed, of course with chrism consecrated by the bishop (St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 15 fin.). And from the *Egyptian Church Order*, if that represents real Egyptian usage, we find that there was first an unction by a presbyter, as in the Roman rite (*Sacr. Gelas.* i 44), and then the bishop, after imposition of his hand with prayer, poured the chrism on to his hand and imposed it again with a formula

'I anoint thee,' &c., and signed the neophyte on the brow (can. 46). Serapion's prayer (16) seems to imply a similar rite; it refers indirectly to the imposition of the hand (γινομένης ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιάν σου χεῖρα) and identifies or closely connects this imposition with the unction and signation. Since, when there were a number of neophytes, the imposition and unction could scarcely take place during the recitation of the prayer, it may be assumed that the prayer was recited first, and so corresponds with the prayer in the same relative position in the existing rite (Assemani iii 82; Denzinger i 209, 230); while the signation with the chrism and the formula 'I anoint thee in the name' &c. followed and, as it were, applied the prayer to the several neophytes. In its central petition for the 'gift' and 'seal' of the Holy Ghost, it conforms to the type of forms of confirmation; while its conclusion corresponds in scope with the prayer which follows the unction in the existing Egyptian rite (Assemani iii 87; Denzinger i 209, 231). And in fact Confirmation in the fourth century was very much what it is now; the only real difference being, that whereas in the existing rites, besides the brow, several parts of the body are anointed (cp. St. Cyr. Hier. *Cat. myst.* iii 4), the early Egyptian evidence is good only for the anointing of the head and the brow.

5. The clothing of the neophyte in white seems to be implied by St. Didymus (*de Trin.* ii 13 fin.); the kiss of peace is given in the *Church Order* (can. 46); and St. Didymus again more than once mentions the communion of the neophyte, following his confirmation (*de Trin.* ii 13, 14). From at least the end of the second century Egypt shared with Rome and Africa the rite of administering milk and honey to the neophyte (Clem. Al. *Paed.* i 6; *Eg. Ch. Ord.* can. 46; *Can. Hippol.* xix; Tertull. *de cor. mil.* 3, *adv. Marc.* i 14), the symbol of his new life in the promised land after passing through the waters of the Jordan (Orig. *in Jesu Nave* iv 1). It remained in the Coptic rite till a few centuries ago (Denzinger i 221 note) and is still retained in Abyssinia (*ib.* p. 232). I know of no fourth-century evidence for the crowning of the neophyte which is found in the present Egyptian rite, in some forms of the Syrian, and in the Armenian (Denzinger i 210, 231, 288, 389).

III. ORDINATIONS.

The process of the promotion of the ecclesiastical orders is already sketched in the New Testament (Acts vi 3, 5 sq.) and consists of the election of the persons (ἐξελέξαντο) after scrutiny of their character and qualifications (ἐπισκέψασθε . . . μαρτυρουμένους . . . πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας), the presentation of them (ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων) and their ordination by imposition of hands and prayer (προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας). And ordination-rites as we find them reproduce this procedure, consisting as they do of the presentation of the candidates, the verification and ratification of their election, and the act of ordination. Serapion supplies the last element for Egyptian ordinations in the fourth century, and other fourth and fifth century documents supply fairly full materials for the reconstruction of the rest.

The Egyptian hierarchy, as described by Serapion, consists of interpreters, readers, subdeacons, deacons, presbyters, and bishops. If singers be substituted for interpreters, this corresponds with the hierarchy commemorated in the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 115, 116, 130) and in the Abyssinian Liturgy (*ib.* p. 207), and with that of the present Coptic Pontifical. In the Coptic St. Mark (*ib.* p. 172) and in St. Gregory, both Greek and Coptic (Renaudot *L. O. C.* i 31, 100), singers are substituted for interpreters, and exorcists are added. Though the last occur in Origen (*in Jesu Nave* xxiv 1), they are there probably 'charismatic,' and there seems to be no evidence that they formed part of the ordained hierarchy in Egypt; and their occurrence in the liturgical texts mentioned above may be only a sign of the foreign origin of the matter of St. Gregory, which may have influenced the parallel passage of the Coptic St. Mark. It may be noted that in Serapion there is no mention of deaconesses or of an order of widows.

(1) *Interpreters* (ἑρμηνεῖς 25). The evidence cited for an order of dragomans has hitherto been only Syrian. The Diocletian martyr Procopius was a reader and interpreter at Bethshan (*Passio S. Procopii* in Ruinart *A. S.* p. 372 ed. Paris 1789); St. Epiphanius places ἑρμηνευταί between exorcists and copiatae in his hierarchy (*de Fide* 21); Silvia of Aquitaine relates that at Jerusalem a 'presbyter' always stood by to translate the bishop's allocutions into Syriac for the Syriac-speaking *assistance*, while the translation into Latin for the Latin-speaking was done informally by 'alii fratres et sorores' (*Peregrinatio* 73 sq.); and interpreters are commemorated in the Messina and Vatican texts of the Liturgy of St. James (Swainson *Greek Litt.* p. 298), in the twelfth-century Sinaitic diptychs (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 501 sq.), and in the Syriac anaphoras of Severus of Antioch, James of Sarug, the Holy Doctors, and John of Bassora (Renaudot *L. O. C.* ii pp. 326, 363, 415, 427, ed. 1847). Serapion now proves the existence of the order in Egypt and confirms the conjecture of Mr. Forbes Robinson (in Hastings *Dict. of the Bible* i p. 670) which destroys the force of the inference drawn from the *Life of St. Antony* as to the existence of a Coptic Version in the middle of the third century; and allows us to recognize in Theodore 'the interpreter,' mentioned in the Life of John of Lycopolis (*Hist. Laus.* 43), a member of the order. There seems to be no other mention of them, unless they are to be identified with the ὑποβολεῖς mentioned by Socrates

(*H. E.* v 22); and if so, they might be elected from among the catechumens. The office of the interpreters is accurately defined by St. Epiphanius (*u. s.*) ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις, and their function was revived in Egypt after the Moslem conquest, before the formation of an Arabic version (Renaudot *L. O. C.* i 187, ed. 1847). In modern Egypt, among the Orthodox the Gospel is read in Arabic as well as in Greek; among the Copts, the Coptic recitation of all the lections, except the Gospel, is reduced to a verse or two, and they are all read throughout in Arabic (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 152 sqq.).

(2) *Readers* (ἀναγνῶσται 25). The earliest mention of a reader in Egypt, outside of the *Egyptian Church Order*, seems to be that of one Maximus in St. Athanasius (*ad Dracont.* 10: cp. [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 11). Socrates relates that in his time in Alexandria, the readers like the ὑποβολεῖς might be chosen from among the catechumens (*H. E.* v 22). If they had ever read the Gospel, they had already in the fifth century been deprived of the right in Egypt, as elsewhere, and it had been appropriated by the deacons, in Alexandria by the archdeacon (Soz. *H. E.* vii 19): and in the *Egyptian Church Order* they are only given 'the Apostle' at their ordination (can. 35). In the present Coptic rubrics all the lections are assigned to the deacons (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 152 sqq.).

(3) *Subdeacons* (ὑποδιάκονοι 25). A subdeacon, the martyr Eutychius, is mentioned by St. Athanasius (*hist. Arian. ad monach.* 60: cp. [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 11), and the description of him as ὑπηρετοῦντα καλῶς recalls both the name they commonly bore (ὑπηρέται *Can. Laod.* 20, *Ap. Constt.* iii 11, vi 17) and the nature of their functions, the humbler and more menial elements of the diaconate, such as the keeping of the doors (elsewhere, and in the East later, the duty of the πυλωροί, θυρωροί, *ostiarii*: Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 § 11, *Can. Laod.* 20, *Ap. Constt.* ii 25, 28, iii 11, vi 17) and the ministry of the water &c. for the handwashing (*ib.* viii 11). Their function at baptisms, in case of necessity, has already been noted (p. 252). In the Coptic form of their ordination their offices are described, in a passage derived from *Ap. Constt.* viii 20, as the custody of the sacred vessels and instruments (but cp. St. Ath. *ap. c. Ar.* 11; St. Cyr. Al. *de ad. in sp. et ver.* xiii [i 454 B]); and in a further passage derived from the Byzantine Ordinal, as the keeping of the doors and the lighting of the lamp (Denzinger ii 5).

(4) *Deacons* (διάκονοι 12, 25). The deacons are regarded as the successors of the Seven (12). The only point in their ministry (λειτουργία 12, 25) which is defined is that of standing by 'the holy body and the holy blood,' i.e. of standing on each side of the altar during the anaphora and perhaps manipulating the fans (*Ap. Constt.* ii 57, viii 12:

Litt. E. and W. pp. 30, 14). I know of no fourth-century evidence for the fans in Egypt, but they were used there later, as elsewhere, and are mentioned in the Arabic *Didaskalia* 38 (*ib.* p. 511); and in the life of St. Nicetas (Surius *de SS. hist.* ii 473), whatever that may be worth, St. Athanasius as a deacon is described as wielding the fan. Otherwise the functions of the deacon in Egypt are the same as elsewhere: in the mass they read the Gospel (Soz. *H. E.* vii 19) and proclaim the directions to the congregation (St. Cyr. Al. *de ad. in sp. et ver.* xiii [i 454 B]; cp. [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 11), which are characteristically prominent in the Egyptian rites; they bring the sacred vessels at the offertory (Cyr. Al. *ib.*), while 'the composing of the table' does not seem to be mentioned (but see *Eg. Ch. Ord.* can. 31); if necessary they take part in the comminution of the host ([Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 13), and they administer the chalice at the communion (*ib.* 12). Their functions at baptism have been already noticed (pp. 249, 251, 252). At the attack of Syrianus on the church of St. Theonas (Ath. *de fuga* 24), the deacon recited the psalm to which the people responded, an office which more normally belongs to the reader; but the circumstances were exceptional. The gifts asked for them in Serapion are the moral qualifications of a clean heart and body and a clean conscience (25), and the intellectual qualifications of a spirit of knowledge and discernment (12); and the latter no doubt have reference to their active ministry among the poor and the sick (*Eg. Ch. Ord.* can. 33, 56; cp. *Ap. Constt.* iii 19) and their disciplinary functions as 'the bishop's eye' (*ib.* ii 44 and iii passim).

(5) *Presbyters* (πρεσβύτεροι 13, 25). The presbyters are regarded (13) as in a sense the successors of the Mosaic Seventy (Num. xi 16–25). Their ministry is defined as the stewardship (οἰκονομῆσαι 13) of the people, the ministry of the word (πρεσβεύειν τὰ θεῖα λόγια 13, πρεσβεύειν τὰς ἁγίας διδασκαλίας 25, cp. 19) and the ministry of reconciliation (καταλλάξαι τὸν λαὸν . . . τῷ ἀγενήτῳ Θεῷ 13, cp. 15). This description is fuller and more definite than in the case of the other orders, and proportionately fuller than that contained in the forms of presbyteral ordination in the Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου and the *Apostolic Constitutions*. This no doubt points to the conditions of the Egyptian Church, where the multiplication of the episcopate was possibly slow and the development of the parochial system was certainly exceptionally rapid (Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii 24 § 6; Ath. *ap. c. Ar.* 85; Epiph. *Haer.* lxviii 4, lxix 2; Socr. *H. E.* i 27), carrying with it the comparative independence and self-sufficiency of the presbyterate. The emphasis laid on the ministry of the word serves to show that, if Sozomen's statement is true, that 'after Arius upset the church' the Alexandrine presbyters were forbidden to preach (*H. E.* vii 19), the measure was a revolutionary one for Egypt. The presbyteral college (συμπρεσβύτεροι 25) of course formed

the council of the bishop (cp. St. Epiph. *Haer.* lxix 3; Socr. *H. E.* i 5) for the administration of the church; it is obvious from the terms in which the business of the broken chalice is discussed (Ath. *ap. c. Ar.* 11, 46, 63) that presbyters habitually celebrated apart from the bishop, which must have been comparatively exceptional elsewhere in the fourth century, except perhaps in Rome; Serapion (25) shows that in concelebrating with the bishop they took a definite part in the prayers, as is still more or less the case in Egypt and Abyssinia, where the assistant priest is probably a survival of the concelebration of the college; and at the communion they performed the comminution ([Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 13) and apparently distributed the particles (*ib.* 12). They obviously administered baptisms apart from the bishop (*ib.* 8), and in that case, as we have seen, administered also the chrism. In fact the later conditions of the Church were apparently in the fourth century more fully anticipated in Egypt than elsewhere. The gifts asked for them, besides the moral gifts of a clean heart and a clean conscience (13), have respect to their functions; a right faith (13), knowledge (13, 25), right doctrine (25) to their teaching office; wisdom (13, 25) and prudence (13) to their administrative and disciplinary offices (cp. St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* xii 1 [iv 1094 E]).

(6) *Bishops* (ἐπίσκοποι 19, 25). The bishop is the successor of the Apostles (14) and his office is the inclusive pastorate of the flock (14), which is not further defined. But it scarcely needs illustrating that in detail this pastorate included in the fourth and fifth centuries in Egypt what it did elsewhere, even though the general episcopate may have been limited by the exceptional ascendency of Alexandria, at least in and after the pontificate of Theophilus (Socr. *H. E.* vii 7). The letter of St. Athanasius to Dracontius implies that the episcopate is of divine institution through the Apostles (c. 3) and is the pivot of the pastoral office; it includes all that has been already assigned to the presbyterate and something more. Baptism cannot be completed apart from the bishop (*ib.* 4), for the bishop alone consecrates the chrism (St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 15). Ordination is of course impossible without a bishop (*Eg. Ch. Ord.* 33; Letter of Egyptian bishops in Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.* 12). And the present collection, with its principal prayers attributed to Serapion, implies the right of origination and chief execution in the sphere of liturgy (cp. Ath. *ad Dracont.* 7). The gifts here asked for the bishop are mostly general—life, holiness, grace and a divine spirit, worthiness of his spiritual ancestry, perseverance in his office without offence and without blame, preservation from temptation (14, 25),—the only specific gifts being wisdom, knowledge, and success in divine sciences (ἐπιστήμαις 25), which may be regarded as corresponding to the three spheres of administration, teaching, and discipline.

There is a plain distinction made in Serapion between the first three, the minor orders, and the last three, the sacred orders; in that the latter alone are described as of divine institution (12) and for them alone forms of ordination are provided. The minor orders are still ἀχειροθέτητοι (St. Bas. *Ep. canon.* iii *ad Amphiloch.* 51); and in this respect Serapion agrees with the *Egyptian Church Order* (can. 35, 36), where there is no imposition of hands, but for the reader the porrection of the 'Apostle' (i.e. St. Paul) with prayer, for the subdeacon a mere nomination; and it is less developed than the so-called Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου (Lagarde, *Opp. S. Hipp.* p. 77), where a subdeacon is ordained with imposition and prayer, a reader is appointed by the porrection of the Bible; or than the *Apostolic Constitutions*, where subdeacons and readers are both ordained with imposition of hands (viii 21 sq.). In the present Coptic Pontifical only the sacred orders are conferred by imposition of hands.

The process of election of presbyters and deacons is described generally by Theophilus of Alexandria (*Canon* 6). The whole clergy agree and choose; the bishop scrutinizes (δοκιμάζει) the character and qualifications of the candidate; and then in open church, by way of guarding against clandestine ordinations, the bishop proclaims (προσφωνεῖ) the elect that the people may testify to him; and lastly, the clergy consenting, the bishop ordains (χειροτονεῖ) in the midst of the church. There is thus an election by the clergy, an examination on the part of the bishop, an announcement on the part of the bishop implying his assent to the election, the testimony of the people, presumably implying a right of veto on their part, and a final consent of the clergy, which in the case of a deacon was presumably a formal presentation and verbal declaration, and in the case of a presbyter was also a co-operation on the part of the presbyters in the act of ordination.

The ordination of a deacon according to the *Egyptian Church Order* (can. 33), as elsewhere, is performed by the bishop alone, who imposes his hands and recites the form. The form in Serapion (12) is of the common type, recalling the ordination of the Seven, invoking the Holy Ghost, and asking for the moral gifts qualifying the subject for his ministry. It may be compared with that of the Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου 5 and *Ap. Constt.* viii 17, which is still used in the Coptic Pontifical. It may be worth while to note that of course the subject is ordained a deacon of the Catholic Church, not of the particular church.

In the ordination of a presbyter in the *Egyptian Church Order* c. 32, as elsewhere, the whole college of the presbyters imposes hands along with the bishop; and the same is implied in the opening words of Serapion's form, Τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνομεν (13). This form may be compared with that of the *Church Order*, which is preserved only in the Ethiopic text (Ludolf *Comment. in hist. Aethiop.* p. 327 sq.), and the more developed form of the same in the Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου 3 sq. and *Ap. Constt.* viii 15. There is in all the commemoration of the Seventy Elders, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the petitions for moral and spiritual qualifications; but in Serapion the definition of functions—administration, teaching, and discipline—is fuller and more emphatic.

The outlines of the process of the promotion of a bishop in Egypt are laid down in the Nicene directions for the reconciliation of the Meletian hierarchy (Socr. *H. E.* i 9), in the Egyptian bishops' defence of the election of St. Athanasius (*ap. c. Arian.* 6), in St. Julius of Rome's comments on the intrusion of Gregory in his letter to the Easterns (*ib.* 30), in Peter II's account of the intrusion of Lucius (Thdt. *H. E.* iv 22), and in Synesius' letter to Theophilus of Alexandria on the affair at Palaebisca (*Ep.* 67). From these it is clear that the concurrence of three bodies was required in the election—of a synod of the Egyptian bishops, of the clergy of the vacant see, and of the laity of the same (cp. Origen *hom.* vi *in Lev.* 3), including in particular the notables and the monks (Thdt. *H. E.* iv 20). And the election required the confirmation of the Pope of Alexandria, a requirement which was sometimes satisfied even in the case of the Pope of Alexandria himself by the nomination of his predecessor (Epiph. *Haer.* lxix 11; Thdt. *H. E.* iv 20; Renaudot *Diss. de patr. Al.* 45). The preconisation (ἀνάρρησις Synes. *Ep.* 67) may be assumed to be the final act of his election and to correspond to the formula Ἡ θεία χάρις of the existing Eastern Ordinals. The consecration was performed by at least three bishops of the province, and might be, perhaps usually was, celebrated in Alexandria. Serapion's form of consecration (14), rather meagre though it is, sums up the topics of that of the *Egyptian Church Order* (c. 31), which was developed out of that of the *Canons of Hippolytus*, and was itself variously developed into those of the Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου 2, of *Ap. Constt.* viii 5, and of the present Coptic and Maronite patriarchal consecrations (Denzinger ii 48, 220). All of them in the address recall the remoter foundations of the episcopate in the divine providence and the immediate foundation in the apostolate, and then invoke the Holy Ghost on the elect, that he may 'feed the flock' and fulfil the episcopate 'without blame,' and manifest the virtues proper to his status. Serapion is exceptional in the meagreness of detail as to what is included in the pastorate.

In the *Egyptian Church Order* c. 31, after consecration the bishop receives the kiss of peace, and the deacons bring him the oblation and he celebrates the mass. If the bishop was consecrated in his own church, he was no doubt enthroned at once (Synes. *Ep.* 67 ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθίσαι; cp. Socr. *H. E.* vii 7); otherwise the enthronization must have been postponed.

It is interesting at the moment to note the contrast between Serapion's forms of ordination and the Bull *Apostolicae curae* of Leo XIII. The Pontiff's condemnation applies with more justice to Serapion than to the Anglican Ordinal. In the form of presbyteral ordination there is 'nulla aperta mentio'—in fact, no mention whatsoever—'sacrificii, consecrationis, sacerdotii, potestatisque consecrandi et sacrificii offerendi,' and consequently 'id reticet quod deberet proprium significare'; and in the form of episcopal consecration there is nothing of the 'summum sacerdotium,' a phrase which first appears in a liturgical formula in the ἀρχιερατεύειν of the Διατάξεις διὰ Ἱππολύτου 2, or of any sacramental act.

IV. Unction of the Sick, etc.

In the lives of the fathers of the Egyptian desert there are several accounts of healing by means of oil: in the cases of St. Pachomius (*Vita S. Pachomii* 30 ἔλας εὐχῆς), St. Macarius of Alexandria (*Hist. Laus.* 20 ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ), Benjamin of Nitria (*ib.* 13 ἔλαιον εὐλογήσας), John of Lycopolis (*ib.* 43 ἔλαιον), and Ammon (*ib.* 53 ἐλαίῳ). And from the occurrence of prayers for the blessing of oil (17) in Serapion, confirming the notice of the *Ethiopic Church Order* (Ludolf *Comment. in hist. Eth.* p. 325; *Litt. E. and W.* p. 190), we may conclude that the 'last unction' was in some form part of the standing system of the Egyptian Church, since a liturgical formula would scarcely be provided for exceptional cases like those above, which are regarded as at least in part miraculous. At the same time in his allusion to the visitation of the sick in 340 (*Encycl.* 5) St. Athanasius makes no allusion to unction, but only to the imposition of hands (cp. *Hist. Laus.* 13, where the imposition of hands is an alternative to unction in Benjamin's healings). On p. 93 it was carelessly said that the evidence for this use of oil in the fourth century is exclusively Egyptian, in forgetfulness that there is a prayer for the blessing of oil and water in *Ap. Constt.* viii 28, which proves that it was also a Syrian usage. And there are other examples—in the life of St. Hilarion (St. Jer. *Vita S. Hilar.* 32 'benedictum oleum'), of St. Symeon the Stylite (Thdt. *Hist. rel.* 26 ἔλαιον εὐλογίας), and of Aphraates (*ib.* 8 ἔλ. τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῇ θείᾳ πληρώσας εὐλογίας); besides the more exceptional cases of the use of the oil of the church-lamp (St. Chrys. *in Matt.* xxxii [al. xxxiii] 6), and of that of the tombs of the martyrs (id. *hom. in Martt.* [ii 669 E]). Otherwise the earliest evidence is Roman. The consecration of oil after the anaphora is alluded to without details in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (iii § 28); and in the letter of St. Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio in 416 (*Ep.* xxv 11) there is a formal response about the oil of the sick ('oleum sancti chrismatis') to the effect that it must be consecrated by a bishop, but may be used by a presbyter or by any of the faithful, and since it is a 'sacramentum' or 'genus sacramenti' it may not be administered to penitents; all of which implies that the last unction is a rite of some standing.

In the life of St. Pachomius there is a story of the healing of an energumen by means of blessed bread, given to be eaten before other food (*Vita S. Pachom.* 30); but I cannot find any other instance. The use of blessed water on the other hand is not uncommon; in the lives of St. Macarius of Alexandria, who used water along with oil (*Hist. Laus.* 20 ἐπιχέων ὕδωρ εὐλογημένον—where εὐλογημένον probably is no part of the true text), of St. Macarius of Egypt (*ib.* 19 εὐλογήσας ὕδωρ . . . ἐπιχέας . . . ἐπηύξατο), and of Theodore of Tabennisi (Ammon *Ep. de SS. Pachom. et Theod.* 10). And in Syria the blessing in *Ap. Constt.* viii 28 is for water as well as oil; and other instances occur in the lives of Macedonius (Thdt. *Hist. rel.* 13) and of Aphraates (*ib.* 8), and in the stories of Joseph the Jew (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx 10, 12) and of Marcellus of Apamea (Thdt. *H. E.* v 21). In *Ap. Constt.* and in the case of Macedonius, as in Serapion, it is implied that the water is to be drunk; in some cases it is poured or sprinkled on the patient.

Clement of Alexandria seems to refer to all three of these rites (*Excerpta* 82). Anyhow he clearly distinguishes exorcised water from the water of baptism (τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ ἐξορκιζόμενον καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα γινόμενον), and the collocation of bread and oil (ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον) with the reference to the consecration by the Name (ἁγιάζεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὀνόματος; cp. pp. 108. 3 above, and 267. 33 sqq. and note, below) suggests the bread and oil of the sick rather than the Eucharist and Baptism.

It is stated in most of these cases that the matter, whether oil, bread, or water, was blessed, and it may be assumed in all. And where the character of the blessing is defined, it is the sign of the cross, generally with prayer, and in one case the imposition of the hand. In most cases the matter is blessed *pro re nata*, and in some the consecrator is a layman. But in *Ap. Constt.* viii 28 it is required that the consecrator be a bishop, or in his absence a presbyter, the deacon standing by; and it may be assumed that in Serapion a bishop or a presbyter is implied. It may be supposed that Serapion's form in the mass (5), like that in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, is for the consecration of matter offered (προσφερομένων) by individuals for their own use; whereas the εὐχὴ εἰς ἔλαιον νοσούντων κ.τ.λ. (17) is for the general purposes of the Church. The form of administration, if any existed, remains unknown. The present Coptic rite of the unction of the sick, like the Armenian, and with some modifications the Syrian, is identical in structure, and for the most part in matter, with the Byzantine, and consists of a sevenfold series of lections, hymns, and prayers.

V. BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

Funeral rites were simple enough, as in essence they have continued to be; and in Egypt they were what they were elsewhere (*Ap. Constt.* 30;

Jer. *Ep.* lxxvii 11), consisting of an office of readings and prayers, the procession to the cemetery with accompanying psalmody, and the act of burial, followed immediately or at an interval by the mass *pro dormitione* (cp. *Ap. Constt.* vi 30, viii 41). Origen (*c. Cels.* viii 30) notes and explains the care bestowed by Christians on the bodies of the dead; and St. Dionysius of Alexandria, in his account of the plague at Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vii 22), adds some details as to the composing of the body. In the *Life of St. Pachomius* there are several notices of funerals, especially in the accounts of the burial of the nuns of his sister's monastery, and of those of St. Pachomius himself and of St. Theodore, his second successor in the abbacy of Tabennisi (cc. 22, 75, 95). On the deaths of Pachomius and Theodore the brethren kept vigil all night with readings and prayers, and in the morning prepared the body for burial; at his sister's monastery, his own brethren 'sang' during the preparation of the body. Embalming continued to be practised in Egypt till at least the fifth century, when St. Augustine notices it (*Serm.* ccclxi 12); and in the fourth century it was common for the faithful to keep the mummies of persons of eminent holiness on couches (σκίμποδα) in their houses, a practice which St. Antony deprecated, and forestalled in his own case by leaving directions for his burial (Ath. *Vita Antonii* 90, 92); and Clement (*Paed.* ii 8 § 73) rejects the crowning of the dead with garlands as pagan. When the body was prepared and laid on the bier (κράβBατος *Paralip. de SS. Pach. et Theod.* 4; κραββάτιον Grenfell and Hunt *Greek Papyri* ii 161), it was carried forth in procession (προκομιδή, ἐξόδιον *Paralip.* 5; cp. Eus. *V. Const.* i 22; *Ap. Constt.* vi 30), the company carrying branches of palm and olive (*Hist. Laus.* 39) and chanting psalms (*Vita S. Pachom.* 22, 65, 75, 95; *Paralip.* 4) as they went to the cemetery (κοιμητήριον St. Ath. *ap. c. Const.* 27, *de Syn.* 13), where they buried the body. At some time the mass was celebrated for the departed (*Vita S. Pachom.* 65; Tim. Al. *Resp.* 14); and in the case of St. Theodore it is noted that the brethren kept some days of mourning for him (*Vita S. Pachom.* 95).

The elements of this rite are implied in Serapion. The prayer περὶ τεθνεῶτος καὶ ἐκκομιζομένου (18) obviously belongs to the preliminary office, as the act of the officiant in which it culminates. In character it is of the general type of Eastern prayers of its kind, and it contains a passage which is common to the existing Coptic and Byzantine rites. It will be regarded as among the most impressive prayers of the collection. The reference to the 'carrying out,' for which ἐκκομίζειν is a technical word, implies the funeral procession. And by providing for the special 'commemoration' (ἀνάμνησις) of the dead, and the insertion of the names of individuals in his anaphora (p. 106. 25 sqq.), Serapion provides for a mass for the repose of the departed.

THE ORDER OF BAPTISM

⟨THE CONSECRATION OF THE FONT⟩

Ἁγιασμὸς ὑδάτων (7)

Βασιλεῦ καὶ κύριε τῶν ἁπάντων καὶ δημιουργὲ τῶν ὅλων, ὁ πάσῃ τῇ γενητῇ φύσει διὰ τῆς καταβάσεως τοῦ μονογενοῦ⟨ς⟩ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ χαρισάμε⟨νος⟩ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ὁ λυτρωσάμενος τὸ πλάσμα τὸ ὑπὸ σοῦ δημιουργηθὲν διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀρρήτου σου Λόγου· ἔφιδε νῦν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα ταῦτα καὶ πλήρωσον αὐτὰ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. ὁ ἄρρητός σου Λόγος ἐν αὐτοῖς γενέσθω καὶ μεταποιησάτω αὐτῶν τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ γεννητικὰ αὐτὰ κατασκευασάτω πληρούμενα τῆς σῆς χάριτος, ὅπως τὸ μυστήριον τὸ νῦν ἐπιτελούμενον μὴ κενὸν εὑρεθῇ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγεννωμένοις ἀλλὰ πληρώσῃ πάντας τοὺς κατιόντας καὶ βαπτιζομένους τῆς θείας χάριτος. φιλάνθρωπε εὐεργέτα φεῖσαι τοῦ σοῦ ποιήματος, σῶσον τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς δεξιᾶς σου πεπο⟨ι⟩ημένον κτίσμα, μόρφωσον πάντας τοὺς ἀναγεννωμένους τὴν θείαν καὶ ἄρρητόν σου μορφήν, ὅπως διὰ τοῦ μεμορφῶσθαι καὶ ἀνα⟨γε⟩γεννῆσθαι σωθῆναι δυνηθῶσιν καὶ τῆς βασιλείας σου ἀξιωθῆναι. καὶ ὡς κατελθὼν ὁ μονογενής σου Λόγος ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἅγια ἀπέδειξεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐν τούτοις κατερχέσθω καὶ ἅγια καὶ πνευματικὰ ποιησάτω πρὸς τὸ μηκέτι σάρκα καὶ αἷμα εἶναι τοὺς βαπτιζομένους, ἀλλὰ πνευματικοὺς καὶ δυναμένους προσκυνεῖν σοὶ τῷ ἀγενήτῳ Πατρὶ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE PREPARATION OF THE CATECHUMENS⟩

Εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ Βαπτιζομένων (8)

Παρακαλοῦμέν σε Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπὲρ τοῦ δούλου σου τοῦδε καὶ δεόμεθα ὅπως καταξιώσῃς αὐτὸν τοῦ θείου μυστηρίου καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου σου ἀναγεννήσεως. σοὶ γὰρ φιλάνθρωπε νῦν προσφέρεται, σοὶ αὐτὸν ἀνατίθεμεν· χάρισαι αὐτὸν τῇ θείᾳ ταύτῃ ἀναγεννήσει κοινωνῆσαι πρὸς τὸ μηκέτι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ μηδενὸς σκαιοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ ἄγεσθαι ἀλλὰ σοὶ λατρεύειν διαπαντὸς καὶ τὰ σὰ προστάγματα φυλάττειν ὁδηγοῦντος αὐτὸν τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Λόγου· ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν

8 Ps. lxxix 15. 18 2 Th. i 5. 28 Ps. xxx 6.

τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

Here follows the Renunciation and the Confession of Faith

Μετὰ τὴν ἀποταγὴν εὐχή (9)

Κύριε παντοκράτορ σφράγισον τὴν συγκατάθεσιν τοῦ δούλου σου τούτου τὴν πρὸς σὲ νῦν γεγενημένην καὶ ἀμετάβλητον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἦθος καὶ τὸν τρόπον διαφύλαξον, ἵνα μηκέτι τοῖς χείροσιν ὑπηρετῇ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας Θεῷ λατρεύῃ καὶ σοὶ τῷ τῶν πάντων ποιητῇ δουλεύῃ πρὸς τὸ τέλειον αὐτὸν καί σοι γνήσιον ἀποδειχθῆναι· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

The catechumen is anointed with the oil of exorcism

Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ Ἄλειμμα τῶν βαπτιζομένων (15)

Δέσποτα φιλάνθρωπε καὶ φιλόψυχε, οἰκτίρμον καὶ ἐλεῆμον, ⟨Θεὲ⟩ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐπικαλούμεθά σε ἐξακολουθοῦντες καὶ πειθόμενοι ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου εἰρηκότος Ἐάν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἀλείφομεν τῷ ἀλείμματι τούτῳ τοὺς † προσ⟨ιόν⟩τας (ἢ † προσιούσας) τῇ θείᾳ ταύτῃ ἀναγεννήσει, παρακαλοῦντες ὥστε τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνεργῆσαι αὐτῷ ἰατικὴν καὶ ἰσχυροποιητικὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἀποκαλύψαι μὲν διὰ τοῦ ἀλείμματος τούτου καὶ ἀποθεραπεῦσαι ἀπὸ ψυχῆς σώματος πνεύματος αὐτῶν πᾶν σημεῖον ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἀνομίας ἢ σατανικῆς αἰτίας, τῇ δὲ ἰδίᾳ χάριτι τὴν ἄφεσιν αὐτοῖς παρασχέσθαι, ἵνα τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσουσι καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀλείψεως ταύτης ἀναπλασθέντες καὶ διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ καθαρισθέντες καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι ἀνανεωθέντες ἐξισχύσουσιν κατανικῆσαι λοιπὸν τὰς προσβαλλούσας αὐτοῖς ἀντικειμένας ἐνεργείας καὶ ἀπάτας τοῦ βίου τούτου καὶ οὕτως συνδεθῆναι καὶ συνενωθῆναι τῇ ποίμνῃ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ συγκληρονομῆσαι τοῖς ἁγίοις τὰς ἐπαγγελίας· ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ⟨σοὶ⟩ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Μετὰ τὴν † Ἄλειψιν † εὐχή (10)

Φιλάνθρωπε εὐεργέτα σωτὴρ πάντων τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν πρὸς σὲ πεποιημένων, ἵλεως γενοῦ τῷ δούλῳ σου τῷδε· ὁδήγησον

---

9 Ps. xxx 6.
16 Sap. xi 26 ; Ps. lxxxv 15.
17 Ps. xxx 6.
18 Jo. xx 23.
26 1 Pet. ii 24.
27 Tit. iii 5 ; Eph. v 26.
31 2 Pet. iii 18 ; Heb. vi 12, xi 9.
35 1 Tim. iv 10.

αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγέννησιν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου. ὁ μονογενής σου Λόγος ὁδηγείτω αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν· τιμηθήτω αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀναγέννησις, μὴ ἔστω κενὴ τῆς σῆς χάριτος· συμπαρίτω ὁ ἅγιός σου Λόγος, συνέστω τὸ ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἀποσοβοῦν καὶ ἀποβάλλον πάντα πειρασμόν· ὅτι διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ⟨σοὶ⟩ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE BAPTISM⟩

The catechumen is immersed three times

Μετὰ τὸ βαπτισθῆναι καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εὐχή (11)

Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας Θεός, ὁ τῶν πάντων δημιουργός, ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, εὐλόγησον τὸν δοῦλόν σου τοῦτον εὐλογίᾳ τῇ σῇ· καθαρὸν αὐτὸν δεῖξον ἐν τῇ ἀναγεννήσει, κοινωνὸν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς σου δυνάμεσιν κατάστησον, ἵνα μηκέτι σὰρξ ἀλλὰ πνευματικὸς ὀνομάζηται μετασχὼν τῆς θείας σου καὶ ὠφελίμου δωρεᾶς· διατηρηθείη μέχρι τέλους σοὶ τῷ τῶν ὅλων ποιητῇ· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨THE CONFIRMATION⟩

The bishop signs the neophyte with the chrism

Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ Χρίσμα ἐν ᾧ χρίονται οἱ βαπτισθέντες (16)

Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ βοηθὸς πάσης ψυχῆς ἐπιστρεφούσης ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ γινομένης ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιάν σου χεῖρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ἐπικαλούμεθά σε, ὥστε διὰ τῆς θείας καὶ ἀοράτου σου δυνάμεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνεργῆσαι ἐν τῷ χρίσματι τούτῳ ἐνέργειαν θείαν καὶ οὐράνιον, ἵνα οἱ βαπτισθέντες καὶ χριόμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ σημείου τοῦ σωτηριώδους σταυροῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, δι' οὗ σταυροῦ διετράπη καὶ ἐθριαμβεύθη Σατανᾶς καὶ πᾶσα δύναμις ἀντικειμένη, ὡς ἀναγεννηθέντες καὶ ἀνανεωθέντες διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας καὶ οὗτοι μέτοχοι γένωνται τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ ἀσφαλισθέντες τῇ σφραγῖδι ταύτῃ διαμείνωσιν ἑδραῖοι καὶ ἀμετακίνητοι, ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἄσυλοι, ἀνεπηρέαστοι καὶ ἀνεπιβούλευτοι, ἐμπολιτευόμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπιγνώσει τῆς ἀληθείας μέχρι τέλους, ἀναμένοντες

---

11 Ps. xxx 6. 23 Ps. lxxxiii 8. 24 1 Pet. v 6. 25 2 Pet. i 3.
26 2 Pet. iii 18. 31 Tit. iii 5. 32 Act. ii 38, x 45. 33 1 Cor. xv 58.
34 2 Th. ii 13 ; 1 Tim. ii 4 ; Heb. iii 6.

τὰς οὐρανίους τῆς ζωῆϲ ἐλπίδαϲ καὶ αἰωνίους ἐπαγγελία⟨ς⟩ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ϲωτῆροϲ ἡμῶν Ἰηϲοῦ Χριϲτοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

The neophyte, after being clothed in white, is communicated and receives milk and honey.

ORDINATIONS

⟨OF DEACONS⟩

Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως Διακόνων (12)

Πάτερ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ὁ τὸν Υἱόν σου ἀποϲτείλαϲ καὶ διατάξας τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πράγματα καὶ κανόνας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ τάξεις δεδωκὼς εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν τῶν ποιμνίων, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους εἰς λειτουργίαν τῆς καθολικῆς σου ἐκκλησίας, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου τοὺς ζʹ διακόνους καὶ χαρισάμενος αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον· κατάστησον καὶ τόνδε διάκονον τῆς καθολικῆς σου ἐκκλησίας καὶ δὸς ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα γνώϲεωϲ καὶ διακρίϲεωϲ, ἵνα δυνηθῇ μεταξὺ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμέμπτως διακονῆσαι ἐν τῇ λειτουργίᾳ ταύτῃ· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨OF PRESBYTERS⟩

Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως Πρεσβυτέρων (13)

Τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνομεν δέσποτα Θεὲ τῶν οὐρανῶν Πάτερ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον καὶ δεόμεθα ἵνα τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆϲ ἀληθείαϲ ἐπιδημήσῃ αὐτῷ· φρόνησιν αὐτῷ χάρισαι καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ καρδίαν ἀγαθήν· γενέσθω ἐν αὐτῷ Πνεῦμα θεῖον πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν οἰκονομῆσαι τὸν λαόν σου καὶ πρεϲβεύειν τὰ θεῖά σου λόγια καὶ καταλλάξαι τὸν λαόν σου σοὶ τῷ ἀγενήτῳ Θεῷ. ὁ χαρισάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματοϲ τοῦ Μωσέως ἐπὶ τοὺϲ ἐκλελεγμένους πνεῦμα ἅγιον, μέρισον καὶ τῷδε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς εἰς χάριν ϲοφίαϲ καὶ γνώϲεωϲ καὶ πίϲτεωϲ ὀρθῆς, ἵνα δυνηθῇ σοὶ ὑπηρετῆσαι ἐν καθαρᾷ ϲυνειδήϲει·

---

1 Tit. i 2, iii 7; 2 Pet. iii 18. 10 1 Jo. iv 10. 17 Is. xi 2; 1 Cor. xii 10.
24 Neh. i 4. 25 Jo. xv 26. 27 Luc. viii 15. 28 2 Cor. v 20.
30 Num. xi 17, 25. 32 1 Cor. xii 8, 9. 33 1 Tim. ii 9; 2 Tim. i 3.

διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

⟨OF A BISHOP⟩

Χειροθεσία καταστάσεως Ἐπισκόπου (14)

Ὁ τὸν κύριον Ἰηϲοῦν ἀποϲτείλαϲ εἰς κέρδος ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὁ δι' αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἀποϲτόλουϲ ἐκλεξάμενοϲ, ὁ κατὰ γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν ἐπισκόπους ἁγίους χειροτονῶν· ποίησον ὁ Θεὸϲ τῆϲ ἀληθείαϲ καὶ τόνδε ἐπίσκοπον ζῶντα, ἐπίσκοπον ἅγιον τῆς διαδοχῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ Πνεῦμα θεῖον, ὃ ἐχαρίσω πᾶσιν τοῖς γνησίοις σου δούλοις καὶ προφήταις καὶ πατριάρχαις· ποίησον αὐτὸν ἄξιον εἶναι ποιμαίνειν σου τὴν ποίμνην ἔτι τε ἀμέμπτως καὶ ἀπροσκόπως ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ διατελείτω· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

UNCTION OF THE SICK ETC.

Εὐχὴ εἰς Ἔλαιον νοσούντων ἢ εἰς ἄρτον ἢ εἰς ὕδωρ (17)

Ἐπικαλούμεθα σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα πᾶσαν ἐξουϲίαν καὶ δύναμιν τὸν ϲωτῆρα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, Πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ ϲωτῆροϲ Ἰηϲοῦ Χριϲτοῦ, καὶ δεόμεθα ὥστε ἐκπέμψαι δύναμιν ἰατικὴν ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαιον τοῦτο, ἵνα γένηται τοῖς χριομένοις (ἢ μεταλαμβάνουσιν τῶν κτισμάτων σου τούτων) εἰς ἀποβολὴν πάϲηϲ νόϲου καὶ πάϲηϲ μαλακίαϲ, εἰς ἀλεξιφάρμακον παντὸς δαιμονίου, εἰς ἐκχωρισμὸν παντὸς πνεύματοϲ ἀκαθάρτου, εἰς ἀφορισμὸν παντὸς πνεύματος πονηροῦ, εἰς ἐκδιωγμὸν παντὸς πυρετοῦ καὶ ῥίγους καὶ πάσης ἀσθενείας, εἰς χάριν ἀγαθὴν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων, εἰς φάρμακον ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας, εἰς ὑγείαν καὶ ὁλοκληρίαν ψυχῆϲ ϲώματοϲ πνεύματοϲ, εἰς ῥῶσιν τελείαν. φοβηθήτω δέσποτα πᾶσα ἐνέργεια σατανική, πᾶν δαιμόνιον, πᾶσα ἐπιβουλὴ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, πᾶσα πληγή, πᾶσα μάστιξ, πᾶσα ἀλγηδών, πᾶς πόνος ἢ ῥάπισμα ἢ ἐντίναγμα ἢ σκίασμα πονηρὸν τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ ἐπεκαλεσάμεθα νῦν ἡμεῖς, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς, καὶ ἀπερχέσθωσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς ⟨καὶ⟩ τῶν

---

6 Jo. xvii 3. 7 Luc. vi 13; Esth. ix 27. 8 Ps. xxx 6. 12 Act. xx 28; 1 Pet. v 2. 19 Dan. iv 14. 20 1 Tim. iv 10; 2 Cor. i 3; 2 Pet. ii 20, iii 18. 24 Mat. iv 23, ix 35, x 1. 29 1 Th. v 23.

ἐκτὸς τῶν δούλων σου τούτων· ἵνα δοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σταυρωθέντος καὶ ἀναστάντος τοῦ τὰς νόσους ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς ἀσθενείας ἀναλαβόντος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *καὶ ἐρχομένου* κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· *ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.*

BURIAL OF THE DEAD

Εὐχὴ περὶ Τεθνεῶτος καὶ ἐκκομιζομένου (18)

Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου *τὴν* ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ *δεσπότης* πάσης σαρκός, *ὁ* Θεὸς *ὁ* θανατῶν καὶ ζωογονῶν, ὁ κατάγων εἰς πύλας ᾅδου καὶ ἀνάγων, ὁ *κτίζων* πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου *ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ* παραλαμβάνων *τῶν ἁγίων τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ ἀναπαύων· ὁ ἀλλοιῶν καὶ μεταβάλλων καὶ μετασχηματίζων τὰ κτίσματά σου καθὼς δίκαιον καὶ σύμφορόν ἐστιν,* μόνος *αὐτὸς* ἄφθαρτος *καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος καὶ αἰώνιος ὤν· δεόμεθά σου περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως καὶ ἀναπαύσεως τοῦ δούλου σου τοῦδε* (ἢ *τῆς δούλης σου τῆσδε*)· *τὴν ψυχήν, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀνάπαυσον ἐν* τόποις χλόης, *ἐν ταμείοις* ἀναπαύσεως μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ *καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀνάστησον ἐν ᾗ ὥρισας ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς ἀψευδεῖς σου ἐπαγγελίας, ἵνα καὶ τὰς κατ' ἀξίαν αὐτῷ κληρονομίας ἀποδῷς ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις σου νομαῖς. τῶν παραπτωμάτων αὐτοῦ* καὶ ἁμαρτ*ημάτων* μὴ μνησθῇς, *τὴν δὲ* ἔξοδον *αὐτοῦ εἰρηνικὴν καὶ εὐλογημένην εἶναι ποίησον· τὰς λύπας τῶν διαφερόντων Πνεύματι παρακλήσεως ἴασαι καὶ ἡμῖν πᾶσι τέλος ἀγαθὸν δώρησαι· διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.*

2 Mat. viii 17. 3 2 Tim. iv 1. 9–12 Sap. xvi 13, 14; Num. xvi 22; 1 Reg. ii 6. 15 1 Tim. i 17. 18 Ps. xxii 1; Mat. viii 11. 22 Ps. xxiv 7. 23 2 Pet. i 15.

NOTES.

P. 263, l. 3. Clem. Al. *Excerpt.* 82 τὸ ὕδωρ . . τὸ βάπτισμα γινόμενον οὐ μόνον χωρεῖ τὸ χεῖρον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἁγιασμὸν προσλαμβάνει: St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 697 A) αὐτὸς γὰρ [Μωϋσῆς] τύπον ἔφερεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ δὲ ῥάβδος τοῦ σταυροῦ, τὸ δὲ πικρὸν ὕδωρ τοῦ εὐλογηθέντος ὕδατος τῆς κολυμβήθρας, which implies the signing of the water; Theoph. Al. *Lib. Pasch.* ii (ap. S. Hieron. *Ep.* xcviii 13 [i 589]) aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu S. Spiritus consecrari; St. Cyr. Al. *in Joan.* ii 1 (iv 147 D)

Πνεύματι μὲν γὰρ ἁγιάζεται τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὕδατι δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἡγιασμένῳ τὸ σῶμα . . . διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τινὰ καὶ ἀπόρρητον μεταστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν, ἁγιάζει τε λοιπὸν τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο: [Tim. Al.] *Respons.* 8 Πεῦσις η΄. Ἐὰν πρεσβύτερος ἐναπολειφθῇ μόνος καὶ δεήσει αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι βάπτισμα, πῶς ὁ τοιοῦτος χρήσοιτο τῇ τάξει; μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ λουτροῦ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας δεῖ ἀποταγὴν τοῦ κατηχουμένου ποιήσασθαι καὶ τὴν χρίσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου; ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἀποταγὴν ἁγιάζειν τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἤγουν τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς κολυμβήθρας; ἢ ἵνα παράχρημα βαπτίσῃ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν καὶ μὴ ἐξιὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀποταγὴν καταλείψῃ τὴν κολυμβήθραν; Ἀπόκρ. Ποιείτω πρῶτον τὴν ἀποταγὴν καὶ τότε προεισελθὼν τελείτω τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ οὕτω βαπτιζέτω.

l. 5. πάσῃ τῇ γενητῇ φύσει. Cp. above, on p. 104. 36.

l. 7. ἐπιδημία p. 105. 10: St. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 9, 10, 31.

l. 8. Cp. Coptic Order of Baptism (Assemani *Cod. lit.* ii p. 173) 'look upon this thy creature, to wit this water . . . and by the coming of thy Holy Spirit grant it the blessing of the Jordan.'

l. 9. Notice the invocation of the Word, as in the mass.

l. 10. Cp. St. Cyril in note on 263. 3 above.

l. 12. μὴ κενὸν εὑρεθῇ. Cp. p. 265. 3.

l. 16. Wob. has πεπονημένον.

l. 19. Cp. Coptic Order (Assemani *Cod. lit.* ii p. 166) 'for thine onlybegotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who came down to the Jordan and hallowed it.'

l. 20. ἀπέδειξεν = made: cp. 264. 11.

l. 21. μηκέτι σάρκα κ.τ.λ. Cp. p. 265. 14 and note.

l. 27. Cp. the Egyptian Order, Assemani i 155; Denzinger i 197, 223.

l. 31. ἀνατίθεμεν. Cp. p. 101. 2.

l. 33. σκαιοῦ: Wob. has read σκαι οὐ and corrected to κακοῦ.

l. 34. MS πραστάγματα.

P. 264, ll. 3, 4. *Renunciation* (ἀποταγή, ἀπόταξις). The form is in *Can. eccles.* 46 (Lagarde *Aegypt.* p. 255; Tattam *Ap. Constt.* p. 56): cp. the Coptic Order in Assemani *Cod. lit.* i p. 157, where the catechumen faces the West and stretches forth his right hand; but there is no direction for the attitude in the *Ch. Ord.*, which here deserts its source, *Can. Hippol.* xix. St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii (iv 683 E) ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐσχάτῃ νόσῳ κατειλημμένων, μελλόντων τε διὰ τοῦτο βαπτίζεσθαι, καὶ ἀποτάττονταί τινες καὶ συντάττονται, τὴν οἰκείαν ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀγάπης κιχρῶντες φωνὴν τοῖς νόσῳ πεπεδημένοις. *Confession of Faith* (συνταγή, σύνταξις: συντάσσομαι St. Ath. *c. Ar.* ii 43; St. Cyr. Al. *u. s.*: συναίνεσις, ὁμολογία *ib.* C; St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 12 [Migne *P. G.* xxxix 672]). For the interrogative form see St. Dionys. Al. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii 9 τῆς συναγωγῆς μετασχὼν τοῖς ὑπόγυιον βαπτιζομένοις παρατυχὼν καὶ τῶν ἐπερωτήσεων καὶ τῶν ἀποκρίσεων ἐπακούσας: St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14 (716) ἐπερώτημα δὲ λέγει (1 Pet. iii 21 sq.) εἰς Θεὸν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς συνειδήσεως ἣν ἐκτιθέμεθα συντιθέμενοι βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα: St. Cyr. Al. *in Rom.* vi 3 (Pusey iii p. 189) προκαταθέμενοι γὰρ ὥσπερ τὸ ἐκ συνειδήσεως ὀρθῆς ἀγαθὸν ἐπερώτημα εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ πίστει παραδεξάμενοι ὅτι καὶ ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἐτάφη καὶ ἀνεβίω τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐσχήκαμεν διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος. For the triple confession, St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* xii 1 (iv 1119 D) τύπος δὲ πάλιν ταῖς μὲν ἐκκλησίαις ἐντεῦθεν (Jo. xxi 15–17) εἰς τὸ χρῆναι τρίτον διερωτᾶν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ὁμολογίαν τοὺς ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἑλομένους διὰ τοῦ καὶ προσελθεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι. For the form of the answer, *ib.* vii (683 D) εἰδέναι γε μὴν ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι Θεῷ τῆς πίστεως τὴν ὁμολογίαν ποιούμεθα κἂν δι' ἀνθρώπων ἐρωτώμενοι, τῶν ἱερᾶσθαι λαχόντων φημί, τὸ Πιστεύω λέγομεν ἐν τῇ παραλήψει τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος. The extension of the hands: St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14 (700) διὰ τοῦ Ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἔλαβε (4 Reg. vi 7) τὸ δεῖν εἰδέναι [ἐδήλου] ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν προσιόντα τῷ φωτίσματι πιστεῦσαι χρεὼν . . καὶ ἐκτεῖναι νῦν τὰς χεῖρας καλῶς εἰς τὸν Θεόν. Cp. *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Can. eccles.* 46 (Lagarde 256; Tattam 58); Egyptian Orders in Assemani i 159; Denzinger i 198, 223.

l. 5. Μετὰ τὴν ἀποταγήν. Cp. [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 8, quoted on 263, l. 3 above, where ἀποταγή must similarly include both ἀποταγή and συνταγή.

l. 6. Cp. the prayer 'Master, Lord God Almighty' in the Coptic Order (Assemani i. p. 160) esp. 'stablish the submission (υποταγη) of this thy servant.' Συγκατάθεσις is not a technical ritual word; but it is used in a general relation to baptism by St. Chrys. *hom.* xl *in* 1 *Cor.* 1 (x 378 E); and, with a reference to the Stoic use of the word, of the assent of faith in Clem. Al. *Strom.* ii 2; St. Bas. *de fide* 1 (ii 224 C); [St. Bas.] *in Ps.* cxv 1 (i 371 C). And συνθέσθαι (St. Bas. *hom.* xiii *in bapt.* 1, 5 [ii 114 C, 119 B]), συνθήκη (St. Chrys. *hom.* i *ad illuminand.* 1 [ii 227 C]), κατάθεσις (Ammon. in *Catena in Jo.* xxi 15), προκαταθέσθαι (St. Cyr. Al. above on 264. 3, 4), are used of the συνταγή.

l. 8. τοῖς χείροσιν may be an allusion to Egyptian idolatry suggested by Sap. xv 18.

l. 9. ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ can scarcely be right: ἀλλὰ σοί seems to be required: or perhaps ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (cp. St. Jo. iv 23 sq., xv 26; Rom. i 9).

l. 14. *The anointing.* The evidence as to this anointing is excellently illustrated by Mr. Scudamore in *Dict. Christian Antiq.* ii 2000 sqq. The oil is 'oil of εξορκισμος' in *Eg. Ch. Ord.* in *Can. eccles.* 46 (Lagarde 255; Tattam 56: cp. Cyr. Hier. *Cat. myst.* ii 3 ; αγαλλιελαιον or γαλιλεον αγαλλιασεως in the Coptic Order (in ref. to Ps. xlv 7). St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 6 § 23 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 556) ἡ κτίσις ἐλαίῳ κτιστῷ ἁγιαζομένῳ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι χρίεται: St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii (iv 683 E) ὅτε γὰρ ἀρτιγενὲς προσάγεται βρέφος ἢ τῆς κατηχήσεως τὸ χρίσμα λαβεῖν ἤτοι τὸ τῆς τελειώσεως ἐπὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι ὁ προσάγων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἀμὴν ἀναφωνεῖ—but here the allusion may be to an unction earlier in the catechumenate.

l. 15. This passage is one of the group labelled Προσευχ. Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου Θμουέως (MS Θμουσέως).

l. 17. Perhaps *τῆς ἀληθείας* goes with *Δέσποτα*, and *Θεέ* need not be supplied. *Θεὸς τ. ἀληθ.* does not occur elsewhere in the group 15–18.

l. 18. St. Cyr. Al. *in loc.* (1101 D) interprets *Ἐάν τινων ἀφῆτε κ.τ.λ.* in reference to baptism, as well as to penance.

l. 20. *τοὺς προσιόντας ἢ προσιούσας.* The MS has *τοὺς προστάσει προσιούσας.* If *ει* be taken as an itacism for *η*, the emendation is easy, if bold: for similar alternatives in these prayers, cp. pp. 267. 23, 268. 17. Wob. reads *τοὺς προθέσει προσιόντας*, which is violent as an emendation and scarcely satisfactory in point of language.

l. 21. *παρακαλοῦντες ὥστε*: cp. pp. 265. 25, 267. 21.

l. 22. *αὐτῷ.* So MS; Wob. unnecessarily reads *αὐτοῖς.* Cp. 265. 26, 267. 22. *ἀποκαλύψαι*: Mr. Turner suggests the emendation *ἀπαλεῖψαι*, which would give a much easier sense.

ll. 27, 28. *ἀναπλασθέντες, ἀνανεωθέντες*, cp. 265. 31. Renewal, recreation seems to be especially prominent in the Egyptian conception of baptism: cp. St. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 9; St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 6 § 4, 12; St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* ii 1 (iv 147 A).

l. 29. *ἀντικειμένας ἐνεργείας*: St. Cyr. Hier. *Procat.* 10.

l. 35. The MS has *ἀνάληψιν.* The only obvious meaning of *ἀνάληψις* in relation to baptism is what is generally expressed by *ἀναδοχή*, *susceptio*, the 'taking up' of the neophyte from the font by his sponsors (*ἀνάδοχοι*, *susceptores*); and *ἀναληφθείς* is so used in Socr. *H. E.* vii 4. But this is obviously impossible here. I have therefore adopted the emendation *ἄλειψιν*, which is not difficult with *τήν* preceding.

P. 265, l. 2. *τιμηθήτω.* Cp. p. 102. 30.

l. 4. *πάντα πειρασμόν*: cp. p. 103. 15, 25, and the prayer before the unction in the Egyptian orders 'take from him all temptations (*πιρασμος*)' Assemani i 162; Denzinger i 199, 224.

l. 9. The presentation of the catechumen and the proclamation of his name: [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 11 *Πεῦσις ια΄. Εἰ ἔξεστι ἀναγνώστην ἢ ὑποδιάκονον ἐπιδιδόναι κατηχούμενον πρὸς τὸ βαπτισθῆναι καὶ βοᾶν τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν κατηχουμένων ἢ οὔ; Ἀπόκρ. Ἔξεστι ὑποδιάκονον ἐπιδιδόναι μὴ παρόντος διακόνου, εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑποδιάκονος μὴ εὑρεθῇ διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην ἐπιδίδωσι καὶ ἀναγνώστης.* For the trine immersion, St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 12 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 672) *τὰς τρεῖς καταδύσεις δεξάμενοι*: 15 *οἱ δὲ Εὐνομιανοὶ μὲν διὰ τὸ μίαν κατάδυσιν ποιεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.* For the form, Tim. Al. *Resp.* 28 (Pitra *Jur. eccl.* i p. 638) in case of a doubtful baptism *ὁ βαπτίζων οὕτως λέγεται* (l. *λεγέτω*) *Ἐὰν μὴ ἐβαπτίσθης, βαπτίζω σε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.*

l. 13. *δεῖξον* = make; cp. p. 101. 1.

l. 14. *δυνάμεσιν.* Wob. has *δυνάμεσι.* *μηκέτι σάρξ κ.τ.λ.* cp. p. 263. 21 sq.: Coptic Order, Assemani i 161; Denzinger i 199 'that he be not a son of bodies, but a son of the truth': St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 12 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 673) *ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ βαπτίσματος μὴ τυχὼν σαρκικός ἐστιν, τοῦτ᾽*

ἔστιν, ἀμέτοχος φωτὸς ἐπουρανίου . . . ὁ δὲ βαπτισθεὶς πνευματικός ἐστιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, μέτοχος ζωῆς ἀθανάτου.

l. 21. *The Chrism.* Origen *hom.* vi *in Lev.* 5 (ii 218) si te abluerit et mundum fecerit sermo legis et unctio chrismatis et gratia in te baptismi incontaminata duraverit: *hom.* v *in Rom.* 8 (iv 561) quamvis secundum typum ecclesiis traditum omnes baptizati sumus in aquis istis visibilibus et in chrismate visibili: St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii. 14 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 712) *τοῦ ἡγιασμένου χρίσματος οὗ λαμβάνομεν ἡμεῖς*: *ib.* 15 (721) *τὸ ἅγιον χρίσμα*: *ib.* 6 § 23 (557) *καὶ ἡμεῖς χρίσμα δεχόμεθα ἐν τῷ ἀνακαινισμῷ . . . μύρον ὃ ἁγιασθέντες ἀλειφόμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως*: St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii (iv 683 E) *τὸ τῆς τελειώσεως χρίσμα*: *Eg. Ch. Ord.* c. 46 (Lagarde p. 255; Tattam p. 56) 'oil of *ευχαριστια*.' Applied to the forehead in the form of a cross: p. 265. 28, St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 14 (712) *σφραγὶς Χριστοῦ ἐν μετώπῳ*: 15 (717) *τοῦ σωτηρίου αὐτοῦ σημάντρου ἐν ᾧ κατασφραγιζόμενοι ἀναστοιχειούμεθα εἰς εἰκόνα τὴν πρώτην.* The formula: *ib.* 15 (720) *εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς κ.τ.λ. ἴσως σφραγιζόμεθα καὶ βαπτιζόμεθα*: cp. Egyptian Order in Assemani iii 83 sq.; Denzinger i 209, 231. For the response 'Amen' see note on p. 264. 14. For the episcopal consecration of the chrism, St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 15 (721) *ἐπίσκοπος δὲ μόνος τῇ ἄνωθεν χάριτι τελεῖ τὸ χρίσμα*: for presbyter's administration, 'Ambrosiaster' *Quaest. in V. et N. T.* 101 (ap. S. Aug. *Opp.* iii app. 93 A) in Alexandria et per totam Aegyptum si desit episcopus consignat (*al.* consecrat) presbyter, and *in Eph.* iv 12 (ap. S. Ambr. ii app. 241 F) apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant si praesens non sit episcopus. (Cp. St. Greg. Mag. *Ep.* iv 26 [ii 705 A].) *Imposition of hands*: Origen *de Princip.* i 3 § 2 in Actibus Apostolorum per impositionem manuum apostolicarum Spiritus sanctus dabatur in baptismo: 7 per impositionem manuum apostolorum post baptismum gratia et revelatio sancti Spiritus tradebatur: St. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 6 *ἔνθεν οὖν* (sc. from Pentecost) *καὶ διὰ μὲν τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐδίδοτο τοῖς ἀναγεννωμένοις τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.*

l. 24. *γινομένης ὑπὸ . . . χεῖρα*: cp. p. 100. 8, where also an imposition of hands is probably referred to. *σου* is either a mistake or it must go awkwardly with *τοῦ μονογενοῦς.*

l. 28. *τοῦ σωτηριώδους σταυροῦ* (MS *σωτηρίου δούς*). The phrase occurs in St. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 20: cp. Euseb. *H. E.* ix 9 § 11 *τῷ σωτηριώδει σημείῳ.*

l. 32. MS *γιγένωνται* (where *γι* is probably an unerased mistake for *γε* following).

P. 266, l. 5. The clothing and communion of the neophyte: St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 13 (692) *ἀλείψας, λούσας, ἐνδύσας . . . καὶ θρέψας τῷ σώματί μου καὶ τῷ αἵματι*: 14 (716 sq.) *τὴν ἀθάνατον κοινωνίαν τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ ἥντινα σὺν τῷ ἀνακαινισμῷ . . . ἀγοράζομεν, πίστιν καὶ οὐκ ἀργύριον κατατιθέμενοι . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φωτιζόμεθα καὶ ἀπολαύομεν σώματος Χριστοῦ μεταλαμβάνοντες καὶ πηγῆς ἀθανάτου γευόμενοι.* Cp. ii 12 (680).

l. 7. Theoph. Al. *Canon* 6 (Migne *P. G.* lxv 40). περὶ τῶν ὀφειλόντων χειροτονεῖσθαι οὗτος ἔστω τύπος, ὥστε πᾶν τὸ ἱερατεῖον συμφωνεῖν καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι, καὶ τότε τὸν ἐπίσκοπον δοκιμάζειν, καὶ συναινοῦντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἱερατείου, χειροτονεῖν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρόντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ προσφωνοῦντος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς δύναται αὐτῷ μαρτυρεῖν· χειροτονία δὲ λαθραίως μὴ γινέσθω· τῆς γὰρ ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνην ἐχούσης πρέπει παρόντων τῶν ἁγίων τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας γίνεσθαι. This evidently refers to elections within the local church, i. e. of deacons and presbyters, perhaps also of the minor orders. In the Nicene Synodal letter (Socr. *H. E.* i 9) the functions of a bishop in the promotion of clergy are described as (1) ὑποβάλλειν ὀνόματα and ὀνόματα ἐπιλέγεσθαι τῶν ἀξίων τοῦ κλήρου, which seem to be two stages of the election on the part of the clergy; (2) προχειρίζεσθαι which seems to mean the formal declaration of election; and (3) χειροθετεῖν, to ordain. For the election of a bishop: St. Julius *Ep.* ap. Ath. *ap. c. Arian.* 30 οὐκ ἔδει τὴν κατάστασιν οὕτω παρανόμως καὶ παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα γενέσθαι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερατείου (the sacred orders), ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ κλήρου (the minor orders), τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπους ἔδει καταστῆσαι καὶ μὴ νῦν τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κανόνας παραλύεσθαι (as in Gregory's intrusion): St. Ath. *Encycl.* 2 ἔδει . . . κατὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας . . . "συναχθέντων" τῶν λαῶν "καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος" τῶν καθιστανόντων "σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" πάντα κανονικῶς ἐξετασθῆναί τε καὶ πραχθῆναι, παρόντων τῶν αἰτουμένων λαῶν καὶ κληρικῶν κ.τ.λ. (of Gregory's intrusion): St. Pet. II Al. *Ep.* ap. Thdt. *H. E.* iv 22 (of Lucius' intrusion) οὐκ ἐπισκόπων ὀρθοδόξων συνόδῳ, οὐ ψήφῳ κληρικῶν ἀληθινῶν, οὐκ αἰτήσει λαῶν, ὡς οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διαγορεύουσι θεσμοί: *ib.* 20 (of Peter's own election) πρώτης μὲν τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης ψηφισαμένης αὐτὸν κεφαλῆς (Athanasius), πάντων δὲ συμψήφων γεγενημένων καὶ τῶν ἱερωμένων καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει καὶ ἀξιωτάτων· καὶ ὁ λαὸς δὲ ἅπας ταῖς εὐφημίαις ἐδήλου τὴν ἡδονήν . . . καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων συνέδραμον οἱ πελάζοντες: *Ep. Synod. Nicaen.* ap. Socr. *H. E.* i 9 (Meletian bishops may succeed to sees) μόνον εἰ ἄξιοι φαίνοιντο (i. e. if bishops and clergy elect), καὶ ὁ λαὸς αἱροῖτο, συνεπιψηφίζοντος αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπισφραγίζοντος τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπου. The part of the people in an election varied no doubt from an overwhelming acclamation, such as Origen complains of (*hom.* xxii *in Num.* 4) and as happened in St. Athanasius' case (*ap. c. Arian.* 6) or a decisive refusal to elect at all, in spite of the mandate of Alexandria, as at Palaebisca (Synes. *Ep.* 67), to a mere testimony or acquiescence.

l. 9. Χειροθεσία is used of any imposition of hands; whether blessing, as above pp. 100–102; or confirmation, Epiph. *Haer.* xxi 1; or ordination, as here: cp. Socr. *H. E.* i 9. In *Ap. Constt.* viii 28 χειροθετεῖν, 'to bless,' is distinguished from χειροτονεῖν, 'to ordain.' Κατάστασις is perhaps the commonest word for the 'constitution' of clergy: cp. Acts vi 3; Tit. i 5; Heb. v 1, vii 28, viii 3: St. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.*

i 42; *Hom. Clem.* iii 64; Eus. *H. E.* vii 9 § 2; St. Ath. *ad Dracont.* passim, *Encycl.* 2, 3, *Ap. c. Ar.* 11, 12, 19, 30; *Vita S. Pachom.* 18; and cp. *constituere*, St. Cyp. *Epp.* i 1, iii 3, xxix, lii 2.

ll. 10–12. There seems to be some connexion with the obscure words of the form of the ordination of an archdeacon in the Coptic Pontifical (Tuki *Euchol.* i p. 25; Denzinger ii p. 10), 'thou hast created on earth every form of them, and hast given names to all the orders (ταξις) and canons (κανων) of the church.'

l. 18. MS αμεμπστως, perhaps corrected.

l. 26. ἐπιδημῆσαι: cp. ἐπιδημία of the Holy Ghost in St. Didym. *de Trin.* ii 16 (Migne *P. G.* xxxix 721), iii 38 977); St. Hieron. graec. *de eff. Bapt.* (Migne *P. G.* xl 864).

l. 28. οἰκονομῆσαι. Cp. Luc. xii 42; St. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xxxii (i 518) τῶν ψυχῶν οἰκονόμοι καὶ τοῦ λόγου ταμίαι.

πρεσβεύειν: cp. p. 103. 29, Eus. *H. E.* i 1 § 1. Cp. St. Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* xii 1 (iv 1100 sq.); *Ap. Constt.* viii 15: *Sacr. Gelas.* i 20. l. 30.

l. 30. MS τῶ Μωσέως.

l. 31. ἐκλελεγμένους: so MS, not ἐκλεγ. as Wob.

P. 267, l. 9. ἅγιον: perhaps, but not necessarily, ἄξιον should be read. Τῆς διαδοχῆς τῶν . . . ἀποστόλων. Cp. Eus. *H. E.* i 1 § 1, iii 4 § 12, 37 § 1, &c.; St. Cyp. *Epp.* xlv 2, lxvi 3, lxxv 17. In *Vita S. Pachomii* 18 (*Acta SS.* mai. iii p. 29*) the clergy generally are called διαδόχους τῶν ἀποστόλων.

l. 12. ποιμαίνειν . . . ἀμέμπτως. Cp. *Can. Hippol.* iii 14; *Eth. Ch. Ord.* (Ludolf p. 324); *Ap. Constt.* viii 4: *Sacr. Gelas.* i 99 ad regendam ecclesiam tuam et plebem universam.

l. 13. MS ἀπροσκόπτως.

l. 18. Of the passages referred to in the introduction the best for the illustration of Serapion is Ammon *Ep. de SS. Pach. et Theod.* 10 (*Acta SS.* mai. iii p. 67*) ἧκει ἀπὸ τοῦ πέραν ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδὸς ξέστην ἀργυραῖον πεπληρωμένον ὕδατος φέρων καὶ μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ Θεοδώρῳ προσαγαγὼν ἔφη Ὀλιγόπιστός εἰμι, δέομαί σου· κἂν γοῦν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο ἐπικάλεσαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ· πιστεύω γὰρ ὅτι εἰσακούσας σου ὁ Θεὸς ποιεῖ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο φάρμακον σωτηρίας τῇ θυγατρί μου. καὶ ὁ Θεόδωρος μὲν τὸν ξέστην λαβὼν καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ μετὰ δακρύων προσευξάμενος τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ πεποίηκεν. For the regular visitation of the sick see St. Ath. *Encycl.* 5 (in reference to the intrusion of Gregory) ὡς ἐκ τοσαύτης βίας . . . πολλοὺς δὲ χωρὶς τῶν ἐπισκεπτομένων νοσεῖν καὶ ὀδύρεσθαι . . . τῶν γὰρ λειτουργῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωκομένων οἱ λαοὶ καταγινώσκοντες τῆς ἀσεβείας τῶν αἱρετικῶν Ἀρειανῶν αἱροῦνται μᾶλλον οὕτω νοσεῖν καὶ κινδυνεύειν ἢ χεῖρα τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν.

l. 25. ἐκχωρισμόν seems to be a ἅπ. λεγ.

l. 28. φάρμακον . . . σωτηρίας, see on l. 18 above.

l. 32. ἐντίναγμα: so MS, not as Wob. ἐντείναγμα. Cp. Ecclus. xxii 13 (A).

l. 33 sqq. τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ., see on l. 18 above.

P. 268, l. 1. ἵνα δοξασθῇ κ.τ.λ.: cp. p. 102. 15. Dr. Nestle has suggested to me that these phrases, in this connexion, allude to Mat. ix 8; Marc. ii 12; Luc. v 25 sq., xvii 18.

l. 7. St. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii 22 § 9 καὶ τὰ σώματα δὲ τῶν ἁγίων ὑπτίαις χερσὶ καὶ κόλποις ὑπολαμβάνοντες καθαιροῦντές τε ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ στόματα συγκλείοντες, ὠμοφοροῦντές τε καὶ διατιθέντες, . . . λουτροῖς τε καὶ περιστολαῖς κατακοσμοῦντες κ.τ.λ. St. Aug. *Serm.* ccclxi 12 Aegyptii . . . diligenter curant cadavera mortuorum; morem enim habent siccare corpora et quasi aenea reddere: 'gabbaras' ea vocant. (Cp. Amélineau *Les actes des martyrs de l' église copte* pp. 234 sqq.) *Vita S. Pachomii* 75 (*Acta SS.* mai. iii p. 44*) ὅλην τὴν νύκτα ἀγρυπνούντων περὶ αὐτοῦ (Pachomius) ἀναγνώσει καὶ προσευχαῖς, κηδευθὲν τὸ σῶμα ἀπηνέχθη ὁμοίως μετὰ ψαλμῶν εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἐτάφη . . . καὶ κηδεύσαντες τὸν ἅγιον Πετρώνιον μετ' εὐχῶν καὶ ψαλμῶν ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος: 95 (50*) ἀγρυπνήσαντες ὁμοίως καὶ πρωῒ κηδεύσαντες τὸ σῶμα ἀπήνεγκαν μετὰ ψαλμῶν εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἔθαψαν . . . καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐποίησαν ἡμέρας σφόδρα λυπούμενοι: 22 (31*) καὶ τελεουμένης δὲ ἀδελφῆς συνάγονται μέχρι νῦν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κατά τινα ὡρισμένον τόπον καὶ οὕτως ψαλλόντων αὐτῶν αἱ λοιπαὶ κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον μέρος ἐνταφιάσασαι ταύτην καλῶς τιθέασιν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ· εἶθ' οὕτως λαμβάνοντες οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μετὰ σεμνῆς ψαλμῳδίας θάπτουσιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ ὄρει: 65 (42*) μετὰ τοῦ κηδευθῆναι οὐκ ἄφηκεν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ψάλλειν εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἀλλ' οὐδὲ προσφορὰ ἐγένετο ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ: *Hist. Laus.* 39 (Migne *P. G.* xxxiv 1105) ἐὰν τελευτήσῃ παρθένος ἐνταφιάσασαι αὐτὴν αἱ λοιπαὶ παρθένοι φέρουσι καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν ὄχθην τοῦ ποταμοῦ· περάσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μετὰ πορθμοῦ, μετὰ βαΐων [καὶ] κλάδων ἐλαιῶν μετὰ ψαλμῳδίας διαφέρουσι ταύτην εἰς τὸ πέραν καὶ θάπτουσιν εἰς τὰ μνήματα ἑαυτῶν: *Paralip. de SS. Pach. et Theod.* 5 (*Acta SS.* mai. iii p. 53*) ἀπερχόμενος δὲ ἀπήντησεν προκομιδήν τινος ἀδελφοῦ κοιμηθέντος ἐκ τῆς μονῆς ἐκείνης· ἦσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τῆς μονῆς ἐκείνης ἀκολουθοῦντες τοῦ ἐξοδίου καὶ ψάλλοντες: [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 5 sums up the funeral rite as εὐχὴ καὶ ψαλμῳδία.

l. 8. ἐκκομιζομένου: see Luc. vii 12; Polyb. xxxv 6 § 2; Plut. *Cic.* 42. Cp. ἐκφέρειν Acts v 6, 9, 10.

l. 16. κοίμησις: *Vita S. Pach.* 96; *Hist. Laus.* 13, 19.

ll. 19–25. τὸ δὲ σῶμα κ.τ.λ. Cp. Coptic *Lit. St. Mark* (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 170) 'raise up their flesh also in the day which thou hast appointed according to thy true promises that cannot lie . . . and to us all grant that our end be Christian,' &c. (also Tuki *Euchol.* i p. 344): Byzantine Γονυκλισία Πεντηκοστῆς (Εὐχολόγιον p. 378 ed. 1869) συνεγείρων καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ὥρισας κατὰ τὰς ἁγίας σου καὶ ἀψευδεῖς ἐπαγγελίας . . . ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς περιεστῶτας εὐλόγησον, τέλος ἀγαθὸν καὶ εἰρηνικὸν παρεχόμενος ἡμῖν.

l. 23. ἔξοδον here naturally means 'departure' (τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ ἐνθάδε σταδίου *Hist. Laus.* 30; τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον Cyr. Al. *in Jo.* vii 697 B; cp. *Paralip. de SS. Pach. et Theod.* 4, &c.) and not, as the Bishop of Salisbury suggests, the going forth of the body to the tomb (προκομιδή), which is called ἔξοδος in *Ap. Constt.* vi 30 and ἐξόδιον in *Paralip. de SS. Pach. et Theod.* 5, quoted above on l. 7.

l. 24. οἱ διαφέροντες is used in the sense of 'the surviving relatives of the departed' in Tim. Al. *Resp.* 14.

ADDITION TO PART I.

Dr. Mercati of the Vatican Library has been kind enough to point out to me that the *editio princeps* of the Sacramentary of Serapion is that of A. Dmitrijewskij in *Trudy*, the Journal of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Kiew, 1894 no. 2; reprinted separately at Kiew in the same year, and reviewed by A. Pavlov in Χρονικὰ Βυζαντινά i 207–213. See *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* iv 1, 1895, p. 193.

P. 90. I have since noticed that the group 15–18, which seems to be attributed to Serapion, is marked by certain words and phrases which do not occur elsewhere in the collection: viz. ἐπαγγελία 15. 3, 32; 16. 14; 18. 12: ἀντικείμενος 15. 14; 16. 8; 17. 13: ὁ κύριος καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. 15. 16; 16. 4, 14; 17. 2; the combination σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα 15. 9; 17. 11; 18. 9: ὥστε instead of ἵνα or infin. after verbs of praying 15. 16; 16. 3; 17. 3: and alternative phrases 15. 5 (?); 17. 5; 18. 9: while ἄφεσις 15. 10; 17. 10 only occurs twice elsewhere in a quotation, pp. 105. 35, 106. 10; and ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργέω 15. 7, 14; 16. 4, 5; 17. 12 only occurs elsewhere in 7. 8. And at the same time the characteristics of the other prayers do not occur in this group (e. g. ἀγένητος, καθαρός, ζῶν, προκοπή, βελτίωσις, ἐκλεκτός). On the other hand the anaphora, which is also ascribed to Serapion, has none of the above characteristics of 15–18, except ἄφεσις in a quotation, and is more closely allied to the rest of the collection than to this group.

P. 97, paragr. 7 requires correction. It should read 'The title *Prayer of the Fraction* is a Syrian and Egyptian characteristic, which has been eliminated from the byzantinized texts of the Greek St. Mark and St. James, where the fraction is transferred to the Byzantine position; but it remains in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic. In the Syriac the prayer is independent, standing before the prelude of the Lord's Prayer, while in the Egyptian it is identical with the prelude of the Lord's Prayer; only whereas in the Coptic it is attached to the Lord's Prayer by the form of its conclusion, in the Ethiopic as in Serapion (2) it is quite independent in form,' &c.

P. 98. 8 sqq. The suggestion here made is confirmed by [Tim. Al.] *Resp.* 13 Πεῦσις ιγ'. Εἰ ἔξεστι διακόνους μετὰ τὴν κλάσιν τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ ἁγίου (the ceremonial fraction), δέχεσθαι καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ μελίζειν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς μέλη (the comminution for communion) ἢ οὔ; Ἀπόκρ. Παρόντος ἐπισκόπου, οὔ· μὴ παρόντος δέ, ἐὰν ἐπείγῃ ὄχλος, γίνηται.

P. 105. 20. Dr. Nestle has kindly pointed out to me that I have not noted the words τὰ δύο τιμιώτατα σεραφεὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα κ.τ.λ., and that Prof. Drews of Jena, in an article in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengeschichte* xx 3 (Oct. 1899), proposes to emend the text by the aid of *St. Mark*, and to read τὰ δύο τιμιώτατά ⟨σου ζῶα τὰ πολυόμματα χερουβεὶμ καὶ τὰ⟩ σεραφεὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα. It seems to me that the text is right as it stands. The LXX of Isa. vi 2, 3 τῷ ἑνί . . . τῷ ἑνί . . . ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον rather suggests than otherwise that the seraphim are *two*; especially if it be taken along with Hab. iii 2 ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ and with the *two* cherubim of the tabernacle (and it must be remembered that Apoc. iv implicitly identifies the cherubim of Ezekiel with the seraphim of Isaiah). And Isa. vi 2, 3 has been commonly so interpreted: e. g. Origen *de Princip.* i 3 § 4 τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐᾳ δύο σεραφὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα κεκραγότα ἕτερον πρὸς ἕτερον καὶ λέγοντα Ἅγιος κ.τ.λ. . . . καὶ ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ Ἀμβακοὺμ Ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ —where he uses Serapion's words and combines Habakkuk with Isaiah; so *hom. in Vis. Isa.* i 2 (iii 106 E) duo video seraphim; *hom.* iv *in Isa.* 1 (iii 112 E); St. Jerome *in Isa.* iii (iv 92 D, E), *in Oseam* iii (vi 140 A), *in Abac.* ii (vi 634 D), *Ep.* xviii 6 (i 48 B), lxxxiv 3 (i 520 D); [St. Bas.] *Comment. in Esai.* 183 (i 513 C); *Glossa ordinaria* in loc.; *Breviar. Roman.* (resp. lect. viii in dominicis p. Pentec.) duo seraphim clamabant alter ad alterum Sanctus &c.; while Eusebius (Migne *P. G.* xxiv 125), Procopius (*ib.* lxxxvii 1933), and Vitringa *in loc.* mention the interpretation to reject it. Origen (*de Princip.* u. s.) attributes the exposition he is giving, which implies two seraphim, to ὁ Ἑβραῖος; and among Jewish commentators the *Yalqut* on Isaiah quotes the *Pirqê d^{e}R. Eliezer* in this sense, while Ibn Ezra *in loc.* explicitly rejects the interpretation. It would seem then that τὰ δύο originally meant the two seraphim; and that when the combination, cherubim and seraphim, became common, the words were reinterpreted to refer to the two classes. The combination, *cherubim*, *seraphim* and *ophanim*, occurs in *Enoch* (lxi 10, lxxi 7) and is apparently common in the Talmud; but I do not know when the combination, cherubim and seraphim, first occurs in Christian writings, unless it be in St. Athanasius (*in illud Omnia mihi* 6 [i 108 A], *ad Serap.* i 13 [i 661 D, E]; not in the lists in *Test. xii patr.* Levi 3, Euseb. *Praep. ev.* vii 15; the ophanim are to be identified with the Christian θρόνοι). The order τὰ . . . σεραφεὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα must be explained by supposing either that σερ. ἑξαπτ. has become, as it were, a compound substantive, or that ἑξαπτ. is to be taken with the following participles rather than with σεραφείμ, as certainly seems to be the case in *Lit. S. Chrys.* (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 322 sq.).

P. 112. To the note on p. 106. 13 add: Letter of Peter II Alex. ap. Thdt. *H. E.* iv 22 τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου ἔνθα κάθοδον τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπικαλούμεθα.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

NOTES

1. ON ST. MARK xv 34 IN *COD. BOBIENSIS.*

Cod. Bobiensis (*k*) is so well edited in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, vol. ii, that the study of the MS itself might seem almost superfluous. Nevertheless in passing through Turin last October I took the opportunity of seeing *k*, and was fortunate enough to decipher one very important word where a later correction has almost effaced the original reading. In Mc. xv 34 *k* has

34 et exclamauit uoce mag
na heli heliaṅm·etzaphani· d̄i me
us d̄i meus· ad quid me MALEDIXIS
35 TI et quidam eorum *etc.*

For *maledixisti* the printed edition has *dereliquisti* in smaller type, with the note 'dereliquisti *est a m.* 3; *quid fuerit prius non liquet.*' But as a matter of fact all the letters (except perhaps the initial M) are still visible, the A, the D, and the final XIS | TI being quite clear.

The effect of the newly recovered reading is greatly to strengthen the case for ὠνείδισάς με (i. e. 'My God, my God, why hast thou taunted me?'), which is attested by D^{gr} and the heathen writer cited by Macarius Magnes[1], as well as by the Latins *c* and *i*. At this point *a b e f q* and *r* are all defective, so that the only Latin attestation for the ordinary text (ἐγκατέλιπές με or με ἐγκατέλιπες) is furnished by *d* (against its own Greek) *ff n* and the Vulgate. The evidence of *n* makes it probable that *a* also would have read *dereliquisti.*

It may be pointed out that *maledicere* is a well attested 'African' rendering for ὀνειδίζειν, for which *exprobrare* or *improperare* is generally substituted in the Vulgate and the 'European' texts (e. g. Mt. xi 20, Lc. vi 22). The three Latin renderings of ὠνείδισάς με in Mc. xv 34 are

me maledixisti	*k*
exprobrasti me	*c*
me in opprobrium dedisti	*i*

so that this reading has undergone in Latin the normal linguistic changes. It probably therefore belongs to the original form of the Latin version.

---

[1] Blondel's edition, p. 21, a striking passage where all four versions of our Lord's last words are given in full side by side.

The temptation to harmonize Mc. xv 34 with Mt. xxvii 46 must have been strong at all times, as well as the tendency toward (supposed) accuracy in translation. But St. Mark's renderings of Semitic phrases usually contain some difficulty: σοὶ λέγω in Mc. v 41 is (to say the least) unnecessary, while no really successful attempt has ever been made to equate Βοανηργές in Mc. iii 17 with 'Sons of Thunder.'

2. ON THE BAPTISMAL RITE IN THE CANONS OF HIPPOLYTUS.

THE *Canons of Hippolytus* were composed in Greek, but they survive only in an Arabic version of uncertain age. Most people read the Canons in Achelis' Latin translation of the Arabic, but as Achelis does not give the Arabic text it is sometimes necessary to go back to von Haneberg's edition, published at Munich in 1870.

Canon XIX, according to Achelis, seems to command Baptism in sea-water. The words are 'prope fluctuantem aquam maris puram paratam sacram' (*Achelis* § 112). In a note to § 135 Achelis explains this phrase as implying a *Taufbecken*, but it is evident that the passage calls for a full quotation of the original text. The Arabic (*Haneberg* 39¹³) has

ويقاموا عند صياح الديك علي تيّار مآء بحر صافي مستعدّ مقدس

i. e. 'and let them assemble at cock-crow by a current of water of a *baḥr*, pure prepared and holy[1].'

Baḥr is used of any mass of water, so that *el-baḥr* comes to mean the sea, just as on the other hand *Baḥr en-Nîl* is the Nile. But I doubt whether *baḥr* without the article would be used for the sea itself. Nor are we to think of a piece of ecclesiastical furniture like Solomon's 'sea,' because *tayyâr* in later Arabic signifies not so much 'waves' as the current of a stream (see *Dozy*, s. v. تيار and طيار). Moreover in Canon XXIX the dust swept from the sanctuary is to be thrown into the water of a *baḥr tayyâr*, which seems to imply a running stream, as in the ritual enjoined by Lev. xiv 5 f., 50 f.

Thus the Canons of Hippolytus contain no outlandish rite of marine baptism, but agree with the Didache in prescribing the use of natural running water—the water, in fact, which the Bible calls 'living.'

---

[1] Personally I should be inclined to read (with the help of the Barberini MS) علي الماء بحر تيار i.e. 'and let them assemble at cock-crow *by the water, a running stream*, pure prepared and holy.'

3. THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ACTS OF JUDAS THOMAS.

THE following pages are an attempt to prove the *Acts of Judas Thomas* to have been originally written in Syriac. These *Acts* are one of the very few 'Gnostic' works which have survived to the present day; they are perhaps the most valuable extant source for the study of the beliefs and aspirations of early Christianity east of the Roman Empire. The question of the language in which the work was composed is therefore of considerable interest in itself. It is also highly important for the textual criticism of the New Testament. If the *Acts of Thomas* were composed in Syriac, there are strong reasons for believing that the author used the Old Syriac Version of the Gospels in contradistinction both to the Peshitta and the Diatessaron. It is unnecessary here to point out the importance of this for the history of the Gospels among Syriac-speaking communities.

These Acts of St. Thomas, the Apostle of India, have come down to us in Syriac, in Greek, in Latin, and in Ethiopic. It is, however, obvious that the original language of the book must have been Greek or Syriac. The Latin is almost certainly taken from the Greek, while the Ethiopic is mixed up with the alternative Acts of St. Thomas at Kentera[1]. The Syriac text of our *Acts* was edited by Dr. William Wright in 1871, with an English translation. The best edition of the Greek and of the Latin is M. Bonnet's *Acta Thomae*, published in 1883. The variants of the Latin MSS are of little importance, but we must take account of the various readings of the Greek MSS recorded in M. Bonnet's apparatus, and of the two fresh MSS of the Syriac that have come to light since Wright's edition.

English scholars have hitherto paid hardly enough attention to the remarkable work which forms the subject of this paper. In many respects it is quite unlike the other 'Apocryphal Acts': as Jacob of Serug says, 'The tale of Thomas the Apostle is a sea that cannot be exhausted.' It is no mere record of miracles and tortures, but an elaborate romance, told with much skill in the delineation of character. The religious enthusiasm of the converted Mygdonia, the honest affection of her old nurse Narkia, the tenderness and despair of Cyrus[2] the unfortunate husband, are brought before us with what we should now call 'insight' or 'sympathy.' But the interest of the writer of the *Acts* does not lie in the narrative. He is to be ranked with Bunyan, not with the modern theological novelist. His chief desire is the enforcement of the strictest continence on all the baptized, even between man and wife. This aim is kept steadily in view: other interesting doctrinal statements and allusions appear from time to time, belonging to a school of thought which is commonly called 'Gnostic,' but holiness, i. e. absolute continence, stands at the head of all the virtues[1]. The moral earnestness displayed by the writer places the book in a totally different category from such works as the Gnostic *Acts of John* or the *Pistis Sophia*. In the *Acts of John* spiritual insight and the perception of doctrine are the supreme tests of discipleship[2]; in the *Acts of Thomas* they are Purity, Temperance, and Poverty. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and it is surely more rational to look for the fundamental ideals of the writer in these virtues, which are praised and enforced on every page with almost wearisome iteration, than in the casual use of Gnostic phrases that occur only here and there[3].

---

[1] This alternative book of *Acts*, lately discovered and edited by Dr. M. R. James, is a late work, but certainly of Greek origin. The fact that such a work was composed *in Greek* in itself suggests that the more famous and ancient *Acts* originated elsewhere.

[2] Cyrus is his name. The Syriac MSS vary between *Kârîsh* and *Kûrêsh* (*Kûrîsh*), which approximates to the true Persian form. The Greek has turned it into Χαρίσιος.

The idea that the *Acts of Thomas* might have been composed in Syriac seems to have occurred to Nöldeke on the appearance of Wright's text, but the most extended expression of his judgement is to be found in some detached notes at the end of the second half of the second volume of Lipsius[4]. These notes, hidden away at the end of a bulky work, do not seem to have attracted the attention they deserve among theologians as well as orientalists. The only other scholar who has had the courage to maintain the Syriac original of these *Acts* is Karl Macke, who attempted to reconstruct the text of some of the incidental odes in the Tübingen (Roman Catholic) *Theol. Quartalschrift* for 1874[5]. Lipsius himself was inclined to think that the Greek was the original (i 300), though in the later volume he seems to side with Nöldeke (ii^2 425). In any case he says of the Bridal Ode, 'Der griechische Text den Eindruck einer nicht immer genauen und öfters unbeholfenen Uebersetzung macht,' and though he supposed that this Ode existed independently of the *Acts*, yet, as he remarks on p. 305, 'Die Stelle, an welcher das Lied in unsern Acten Aufnahme gefunden hat, ist keine unpassende.'

---

[1] In the description of hell (*Wright* 225 ff. = *Bonnet* 39 ff.), where the Greek enlarges upon the torments of all classes of sinners, the Syriac describes only the punishment of breaches of the seventh commandment. The whole description is left out in the Latin.

[2] *Acta Iohannis* xv (*Texts and Studies*, V i p. 22).

[3] It is necessary to emphasize the strong ethical element in the *Acts of Thomas* because it has been so lightly passed over by the distinguished scholars who have investigated the book. This is especially the case in the elaborate study by R. A. Lipsius in his work, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* (vol. i, pp. 225–347). Moreover, no one can read the *Acts* themselves without feeling that the theology of the author is based on the Sacraments rather than on Creeds or formal cosmogonies.

[4] Lipsius, *Apok. Apgesch.* ii^2 423–5.

[5] My friend Mr. R. H. Kennett, of Queens' College, Cambridge, University Lecturer in Aramaic, tells me that Professor Bensly, when lecturing in 1883–4 on

When we examine the *Acts of Thomas* as a whole, apart from the specifically 'Gnostic' passages, with the view of finding out in what language it was originally written, it is not everywhere easy to decide at once between the Syriac and the Greek. Most of the lines of argument which naturally present themselves are double-edged. The decisive evidence does exist, as I hope to show, but it is important clearly to recognize the ambiguous nature of much that might have been expected to produce results. The argument from style is by itself inconclusive. The Greek is at least a respectable piece of writing; the Syriac is the model of what Aramaic should be. Whichever of the two be the translation, it is evident that no attempt was made at literalness. The Greek and the Syriac often verbally agree, but not often so as to reproduce in the translation the unmistakable idioms of the original. The consideration of the Biblical quotations gives a similarly negative result. The quotations in the Syriac *Acts* contain striking agreements with the Biblical text, especially that of the Old Syriac MSS, while the quotations in the Greek *Acts* are less precise. It may be urged on the one hand that the author wrote in Syriac, and used the current Biblical version, but when the work was translated into Greek the points of contact with the Biblical text were obscured. On the other hand, some one might say that if the Syriac were a translation the translator may have been influenced by the Syriac Bible, so that what were originally mere allusions have been brought into conformity with the words of Scripture.

The only way by which we can prove the Greek to be taken from the Syriac is to find instances where the Greek translator has actually mistranslated a Syriac idiom, or has followed a text which rests upon a palaeographical corruption in the Syriac. Such passages are naturally

the *Acts of Thomas* for the Semitic Languages Tripos, used always to declare his adherence to Nöldeke's theory of a Syriac original. Mr. Kennett kindly lent me his own lecture-notes. Among other fresh examples, Bensly pointed out that in *Wright* 176^1 the Syriac has ܗܝܕܝܢ ܙܡܪܬܐ i. e. 'then a flute-player (came . . .),' but the corresponding Greek (*Bonnet* 7^5) begins *ἡ δὲ αὐλήτρια*, although the girl had not been mentioned before. The Greek translator, therefore, read ܗܝ ܕܝܢ for ܗܝܕܝܢ. It must ever be a matter of great regret that we can never have the full results of Bensly's acute and painstaking study of these *Acts*.

not to be met with everywhere, but I think the examples that I have been able to find are enough to carry conviction.

To avoid misconception it may be remarked that instances where our Syriac MSS have a better text than the Greek, or the Greek than the Syriac, in themselves prove nothing as to the original language of the *Acts*. It is certain that the text has been much altered both in Greek and Syriac subsequent to the time of the translation, so that the true reading is preserved sometimes in the one language and sometimes in the other. If there were places where the text of our Syriac MSS seemed to rest on confusions in the Greek, it would prove the Greek to be original and the Syriac a translation. But to the best of my belief no clear instance of this is to be found[1].

1. The most striking mistranslation of a Syriac idiom is found in the story of Sifur the General and the Wild Asses. In a farewell address to his flock the Apostle Thomas says:—

Wright 237^11—14 = *Bonnet* 48^13—16

ܘܗܘܝܬܘܢ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܠܢ ܘܚܙܝܢ ܠܢ.	'And be ye holding to us and looking at us
ܐܝܟ ܡ̈ܫܡܫܢܘܗܝ ܕܐܠܗܐ.	as the ministers of God;
ܟܕ ܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܐܠܐ ܡܫܩܠܝܢ ܛܥܢܐ	though we also, if we do not *take pains*
ܕܢܫܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܫܡܐ.	that we may be worthy of this name,
ܡܣܡ ܒܪܫܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ:	*punishment* we shall receive,
ܘܠܕܝܢܐ ܘܠܬܒܥܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܢ.	and for judgement and requital it will be to us.'

The corresponding Greek is

καὶ μέμνησθε ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν· καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν μὴ τὸ τῶν ἐντολῶν φορτίον τελέσωμεν, *οὐκ ἄξιοί ἐσμεν κήρυκες τοῦ ὀνόματος εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ* τὴν τιμωρίαν *ὕστερον ἐκεῖ* τῆς *ἑαυτῶν ἀποτίσομεν* κεφαλῆς.

Here are two mistranslations in one sentence. The expression that I have translated 'take pains' is literally 'take up the burden.' It is very frequent in the noun *shqâl ṭa'nâ*, 'zeal, diligence,' but the corresponding verbal phrase does not seem to be so much used. Perhaps for that reason the Greek of the *Acts* has taken it literally, and in so doing has introduced the wholly foreign notion of bearing the heavy burden of the commandments[2]. In the next clause ܡܣܡ ܒܪܫܐ, lit.

---

[1] On p. 215 of the Syriac, note b, where Dr. Wright suggests that the Syriac is mistranslated from the Greek, the confusion rests upon the interchange of ܐܢܐ and ܗܢܐ, as is now shown by the Cambridge MS.

[2] Dr. Wright (trans., p. 205), following the Greek, has also missed the turn of

'a putting upon the head,' means *punishment,* not necessarily capital. The τῆς ἑαυτῶν . . . κεφαλῆς of the Greek is quite uncalled for, and must have come from a blind following of the Syriac idiom[1].

2. A curiously similar mistranslation is to be found in

Wright 245^{14} = *Bonnet* 51^{36}

ܪܫܝܢܐ ܡܩܒܠ ܐܢܬ, 'thou dost receive *blame.*'

κατὰ κεφαλῆς δίδωσί σοι τὴν τιμωρίαν is the corresponding Greek. Here again κεφαλῆς has been wrongly brought in. *Reshyânâ,* 'blame,' has nothing to do with *rêshâ,* 'head,' though the apparent resemblance is sufficiently close to entrap the unwary.

We can hardly expect to pick out many instances of sheer blundering such as these in the Greek *Acts.* More often the tell-tale error in the Greek has arisen from a slight palaeographical corruption in the Syriac. Such errors once made in a translation are hardly ever got rid of, for there is nothing to make us imagine that the Greek was ever revised in later times from the Syriac, or *vice versa.*

Of the Syriac corruptions underlying the Greek text of the *Acts* I will give some examples.

3. *Wright* 183^{5} = *Bonnet* 12^{19}

καὶ ὅτι ἐξουθένισα τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον.

These words form part of the bride's speech to her mother after her conversion on the bridal night. They are quite unsuitable, because the bridegroom also is represented as having been converted with the bride. But the Syriac has 'this deed of corruption' instead of 'this man'; that is to say, the Greek translator read ܥܒܕܐ ('deed') as ܓܒܪܐ ('man'), at the same time omitting the words 'of corruption' which had become unintelligible[2].

A little above (*Wright* 183^{2} = *Bonnet* 12^{17}) the Greek reads 'amazement' where the Syriac has 'repentance' (i. e. ܡܬܬܘܗܐ and ܬܘܗܬ ܢܦܫܐ for ܡܬܬܘܝܐ and ܬܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ); but I do not press this instance, because some may here prefer the reading of the Greek and regard our Syriac text as corrupt.

4. *Wright* 198^{14} = *Bonnet* 24^{14}

καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτοὺς καταδήσας.

For καταδήσας (i.e. ܐܣܪܬ) the Syriac has ܐܣܪܚܬ, 'I corrupted,' a much more appropriate and uncommon word. The speaker is the Serpent,

---

the phrase. But it occurs again in these *Acts,* e.g. *Wright* 273^{9}, where 'take pains' duly appears in the translation (p. 237).

[1] The same overliteral translation of *msâm brêshâ* occurs again in the *Acts* (*Bonnet* 17^{3} = *Wright* 189^{8}).

[2] This instance is also brought forward by Nöldeke. But, as printed in Lipsius (ii^{2} 424), there seems to be some confusion. The Syriac as it stands reads 'this work,' not 'this slave,' for the word for 'slave' is written ܥܒܕܐ with a point below.

who caused the fall of the angels and then *corrupted* them according to the ancient exegesis of Gen. vi 2.

5. *Wright* $217^{4, 5}$ = *Bonnet* $35^{2, 3}$

θεὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ καταφρονούμενος ἕως ἄρτι.

Here ἕως ἄρτι is intolerably harsh. The Syriac has 'Son of God Most High, that becamest a man despised *and lowly.*' The last two words are ܘܡܟܝܟܐ: probably the Greek translator read ܘܡܟܐ, i. e. *and from then*, which he paraphrased into ἕως ἄρτι.

6. *Wright* 209^{2} = *Bonnet* 30^{1}

ἀναπαύων ἐν σώμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις· ὁ σωτὴρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν.

The Syriac of this is ܡܚܝܢܐ ܕܦܓܪܝܢ. ܘܡܚܝܢܐ ܕܢܦܫܬܢ., i. e. *Saviour of our bodies and Saviour of our souls*, a much more appropriate phrase than the unintelligible and ill-balanced Greek. It would be difficult to derive the Syriac from the Greek; on the other hand the Greek is easily explained as a corruption of the Syriac. ἀναπαύων is ܡܢܝܚ (or ܡܢܝܚܢܐ, as in *Wright* 230^{16}), and σώμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις looks like a reduplication of ܦܓܪܝܢ read as *pagrîn* not *pagrain.* It is quite possible that the author of the *Acts* wrote ܡܢܝܚܢܐ in the second place, with the same sort of reference to Matt. xi 29 as in *Wright* 206 (last line). But if that be the case, the corruption was anterior to the Greek text of the *Acts.*

7. *Wright* $237^{16, 17}$ = *Bonnet* $48^{18, 19}$

Κύριε, ὁ δεσπόζων πάσης ψυχῆς τῆς ἐν σώματι οὔσης· κύριε, πάτερ τῶν εἰς σὲ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐχόντων (*sic*) ψυχῶν.

The Syriac is:—*Lord of all the ages that wait for Him, and God of all the souls that hope in Him.*

The clauses have got transposed, and we should probably read αἰώνων for ψυχῶν[1]. At any rate, τῆς ἐν σώματι οὔσης corresponds to '*that hope in Him*'—in Syriac, ܕܒܗ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ. It is therefore evident that the Greek is an attempt to translate not ܡܣܒܪܝܢ, i. e. 'hoping,' but ܡܒܣܪܝܢ, i. e. 'incarnated.' The balance of the clauses in the Syriac is too harmonious to be the result of an accidental permutation of letters.

To these examples of palaeographical confusion I add a couple of passages of a somewhat different kind.

8. *Wright* 315^{14} = *Bonnet* 91^{3}

τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπέθηκα ἀρότρῳ τῷ ζευκτῷ.

The variation in the MSS makes it evident that transcribers have been conscious of a difficulty. The Gospel text of Luke ix 62 has simply ἐπ' ἄροτρον, which the Syriac versions (even the Peshitta) render ܥܠ ܚܪܒܐ ܕܦܕܢܐ, 'on the ploughshare[2],' and the same expression here meets us in the Syriac *Acts.* Now ζευκτοῦ corresponds to ܦܕܢܐ (i. e. 'yoke') in

---

[1] The Greek text here rests upon a single MS, and the masc. ἐχόντων may be a relic of the lost reading.

[2] This was almost necessary in Syriac, because ܚܪܒܐ by itself means 'sword.'

Bonnet 90^7 = *Wright* 315^1, so that the phrase in the Greek text of these *Acts* is seen to be a translation of the inevitable Syriac rendering of Luke ix 62.

9. *Wright* 209^{10-13} = *Bonnet* 30^{11-13}

δοξάζομεν καὶ ὑμνοῦμεν σὲ καὶ τὸν ἀόρατόν σου πατέρα καὶ τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν μητέρα πάσης τῆς κτίσεως.

I have selected this passage because it is typical of many others, where I believe a high-sounding 'Gnostic' phrase to have come into the Greek text of the *Acts of Thomas* through mere awkwardness on the part of a translator. 'The Mother of all creation' is impressive and quite unbiblical; so one naturally turns to pick out an Aeon of Basilides or Valentinus with which She may be identified. But this tetrad is a very suspicious collocation of beings. It is impossible to assign any rational place to the ἅγιον πνεῦμα mentioned in it.

The Syriac has: 'We glorify Thee, and we exalt through Thee Thy exalted Father, who is invisible, and the holy Spirit who broodeth over all created things[1].'

It is true that this doxology is more orthodox in form. Nevertheless I believe it to be original. The reference to Gen. i 2 is singularly appropriate in an ascription of praise to that Spirit which had given rational speech to a dumb animal. But it would not be generally understood in Greek[2]. The neuter πνεῦμα could not 'brood,' like the feminine Spirit of Semitic thought. So the translator introduces a fresh personality, and changes the 'brooding one' into a 'mother' quite distinct from the neuter ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

Similarly a μήτηρ is brought in by the Greek in *Wright* 219^4 = *Bonnet* 36^9, where the Syriac has 'thou (*fem.*) that givest life'—an epithet of the Communion of the Eucharist.

Each of these nine passages contains enough to raise the question of the original language of the *Acts of Thomas*; taken together, their evidence appears to me irresistible[3]. But the proof does not rest wholly on these test passages. Still less is it the case that other lines of argument tend to an opposite conclusion. As remarked above, much of the evidence is not by itself sufficient to prove the theory, but it is useful as corroboration of an already strong case.

---

[1] The concluding words are ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܪܚܦܢܝܬܐ ܥܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ.

[2] The Greek Bible and the later Jewish exegesis have ἐπεφέρετο and ἐπιφερόμενον in Gen. i 2, no doubt out of scruple. But the Syriac, being (as St. Basil most truly says) akin to Hebrew, has here preserved the meaning of the original. The story goes that St. Basil owed his information to St. Ephraim.

[3] It would be impossible, without writing a critical commentary, to discuss all the passages where accidental corruptions and intentional alterations of various kinds have obscured the usual superiority of the Syriac to the Greek. I cannot but think that the burden of proof now lies on the other side, and that in what follows I may assume that these *Acts* were originally composed in Syriac. The MS published by Dr. Wright preserves with tolerable completeness the original Syriac text, though a full collation of the Sachau MS (or its Cambridge counterpart), and still more of the ancient palimpsest fragments at Sinai, would no doubt remove many blemishes.

The first of these subsidiary lines of argument is the state of the Greek text, which clearly was once in much closer agreement with the Syriac. M. Bonnet has collated four MSS, P Q R and S, P alone giving an approximately full text of the *Acts*. Where the others are extant they differ widely among themselves, but it frequently happens that one or other is in literal agreement with the Syriac. Thus Q supports the Syriac against P and S on p. 90^9; R alone preserves the beginning of the speech on p. 81, though in a form so corrupt as to be quite untranslatable without the help of the Syriac [1]; S supports the Syriac on p. 89^1 against P and R [2].

Among the instances where our Greek text has suffered corruption I am inclined to place *στεφάνων* (*Bonnet* 6^9). According to the Greek, 'crowns' were handed to the guests at the marriage-feast of the king's daughter. The Syriac (*Wright* 175^{17}) has *kessânê*, i. e. the 'cracknels' of 1 Kings xiv 3, and Nöldeke has shown that this was highly appropriate to the occasion, as among the Jews these very *kessânê* took the place of wedding-cake [3]. But I do not think the discrepancy between the Greek and the Syriac is here due to the translator, and I venture to suggest that the Greek had originally not *στεφάνων* but *σταφίδων*. Without entering upon subtle inquiries about the real composition of Eastern wedding sweetmeats, it may be remarked that a prevailing tradition among the ancient Syriac lexicographers was that the *kessânê* were some preparation of dried fruits [4]. This opinion seems to have been followed by the Greek translator of the *Acts of Thomas*, who wrote accordingly *σταφίδων* here, which has been subsequently changed to *στεφάνων*, no doubt because *στεφάνων* (as Nöldeke remarks) *sieht so schön und passend aus!*

Another point which claims attention is the name given to St. Thomas. The book is 'The Acts of *Judas* Thomas,' and in the course of the narrative the Apostle is commonly called Judas and not Thomas, at least in the better MSS, both Syriac and Greek. This can be paralleled only from the old Syriac Gospels, and from certain ancient Syriac sources, such as the *Doctrine of Addai*[1]. The older Syriac-speaking Church seems to have been aware that Θωμᾶς *T'ôma* was the equivalent of Δίδυμος, and they held that the real name of St. Thomas was Judas the Twin[2]. The amazing thing about the name is that the author of these *Acts* regarded St. Thomas as the twin of our Lord Himself. Our Lord is mistaken for His brother (*Wright* 180 f. = *Bonnet* 11), and Judas Thomas is mistaken for our Lord (*Wright* $321^{19\text{ ff.}}$ = *Bonnet* $80^{24, 25}$)[3]. Moreover, he is twice called 'Twin of the Messiah,' not by mere men who might be in error, but by an evil Serpent who was a devil in disguise (*Wright* 197^{15} = *Bonnet* 23^{22}), and by a wild ass miraculously endowed with speech (*Wright* 208^{8} = *Bonnet* 29^{20}). It is not surprising to find that the Syriac MS has been tampered with here, and that the scribe, by altering a letter, has changed 'twin' into 'ocean-flood[4].'

---

[1] The words *ὁ ἕτερος* (*sic*) *καὶ ὁ σύμμαχος καὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων* correspond to ܡܚܒܢܐ ܘܬܟܠܐ ܕܡܚܝܠܐ i.e. 'Friend and Defence of the weak!'

[2] In this noteworthy reading the Syriac and S both have the words, 'Thou hast taught me thus to pray; behold, Thy prayer I pray and Thy will to the end I do,' which are omitted in P and R. But the Lord's Prayer, with which in the Syriac the whole prayer of St. Thomas begins, and without which the sentence just quoted is meaningless, is absent from all the Greek MSS.

[3] Lipsius, *Apok. Apgesch.* ii^2 423.

[4] See the authorities in Payne Smith *ad voc.*

It would be interesting to discuss the evidence to be derived from the geographical and proper names in these *Acts*. Some of them very strongly suggest a Syriac origin. Thus ܣܢܕܪܘܟ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ, the *City of Sandarûk*, at once reminds the Syriac reader of ܣܢܕܪܘܢ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ at the beginning of the essentially Syriac *Romance of Julian*[5]. The merchant's name *Ḥabban* also sounds much more Semitic than Greek. *Mygdonia* (or should it not be in Syriac *Magdonia*?) is another name for Nisibis. But the majority of the names are not Greek or Syriac, but old Persian, and they appear in a Syriac form which (to say the least) does not suggest transmission through the Greek. The name of King *Mazdai* is that of the well-known satrap of Babylonia (died 328 B.C.). He was known to the Greeks as Μαζαῖος, but ܡܙܕܝ is the spelling both of the *Acts* and of the satrap's own coins. The mere fact that for information about these names we have to turn to Justi rather than to Pape is a sufficient indication of their Persian origin[1]. At the end of the *Acts* the body of St. Thomas is stolen away from India and carried back to *Mesopotamia* according to two of M. Bonnet's Greek MSS, to *Edessa* according to the Latin, but according to other Greek MSS and the Syriac to 'the *West*.' Now a Syriac writer in the Persian Empire might very well think of Edessa as being in the West, but who could be writing Greek to the east of Edessa?

---

[1] The 'Judas, not Iscariot,' of John xiv 22 is rendered *Judas Thomas* in Syr. *crt* and *Thomas* alone (*sic*) in Syr. *sin*. The Apostle Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου is always rendered in Syriac *Judas son of James*, and so is kept quite distinct from the Judas who is Thomas. This linguistic peculiarity is quite overlooked by Lipsius (*Apok. Apgesch.* i 227).

[2] In Syriac 'twin' is ܬܐܡܐ *tâ'mâ*, 'Thomas' is ܬܐܘܡܐ *Tômâ*, but the ܐ (which is preserved in writing) shows that its signification was recognized. The *ô* comes from the influence of the Greek, which in turn represents the Hebrew (and Palestinian Aramaic) vocalization.

[3] Compare also *Wright* 325 last line = *Bonnet* 84^{9}, 'I am not Jesus, but I am the slave of Jesus,' words which seem to recall Jude 1. The allusion in Priscillian 44 (*Iuda apostolus . . . ille didymus domini*) probably comes from the use of the Latin *Acta Thomae.*

[4] In Wright's MS ܬܐܘܡܐ has been changed into ܬܗܘܡܐ. The original reading of the *Acts* was probably ܬܐܡܐ, as in the Greek ὁ δίδυμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The other Syriac MS has 'Thomas, friend of the Messiah,' and 'Apostle of the Messiah.'

[5] The Greek has lost the first letter of this name, εἰς ἀνδράπολιν being read for εἰς Σανδρ-.

One other point remains to be noticed, interesting in itself and important as showing the kind of corruption undergone by our MSS of the Syriac text. In two places we meet with the remarkable phrase ἐλθὲ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος (*Bonnet* 29^{19} = *Wright* 193^{11}; *Bonnet* $36^{3, 4}$ = *Wright* 218^{16}). In the Syriac this disappears, and in its stead we find the commonplace expressions, 'Come, Communion of Blessing,' and 'Come, Holy Spirit[2].' The Greek obviously could not here have been derived from the existing Syriac. We therefore ask ourselves: Is there any appropriate Syriac phrase of which ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος might be a translation, which in the original would be likely to give offence? The answer is undoubtedly, Yes. The phrase occurs in eucharistic prayers, so that the Communion spoken of must be the Communion of our Lord, the Son of man. Now the oldest Syriac rendering of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is ܒܪܗ ܕܓܒܪܐ, i.e. *Filius uiri.* This rendering, incredible as it seems, is actually found in a number of passages[3] instead of the familiar ܒܪܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ, i.e. *Filius hominis.* If the original Syriac text of our *Acts* had in each place 'Come, Communion of the Son of man,' it is easy to see the derivation of the mysterious phrase in the Greek *Acts*, and at the same time to understand the reason for its disappearance from our Syriac MSS. With this explanation I venture to claim that the occurrence of κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος contains in itself an argument for regarding the Greek *Acta Thomae* as a translation from the Syriac[4].

An investigation such as this cannot but be full of technical details. But the result arrived at is not merely interesting from the linguistic side: it also enables us to place the *Acts of Thomas* in their historical setting. Now that we have good reason for regarding these *Acts* as a Syriac composition, the many coincidences in them with Bardesanian doctrines acquire a new significance. St. Ephraim the Syrian in his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles[1] accuses the disciples of Bardaisan of propagating their master's heresies by forged Acts of the Apostles; it is not too great a leap to say that he has the *Acts of Judas Thomas* in view. In these *Acts* therefore are reflected the religious aspirations of the great missionary Gnostic who, whatever were his errors, was one of the chief pioneers of Christianity in the East.

---

[1] See Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, e.g. for Manučihr 190^b and for Wēžan 367^a.

[2] The Cambridge MS has 'Come, Holy Spirit,' in both places.

[3] Mark viii 38 *sin*; Luke vii 34 *sin-crt*, ix 26 *crt*, xxii 48 *crt*; John xiii 31 *sin*; and the Palestinian Syriac texts *passim*. The phrase occurs in Syriac literature in Aphraates (Wright's ed., p. 222 last word); I have verified the reading from the only surviving MS.

[4] Lipsius (*Apok. Apgesch.* i 314) renders κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος by *Genossin des Männlichen*, and explains this as the spouse of the Male Aeon! But is there any authority for taking κοινωνία in the concrete sense of 'co-partner'? The Syriac certainly means 'communion,' not 'sharer' (as in trans., p. 166).

F. C. BURKITT.

THE TEXT OF CODEX Ψ IN ST. MARK.

OF the MSS seen but not examined by Dr. Gregory in the monastery of the Laura on Mt. Athos, probably the most important was the one he calls Ψ, which is now numbered 172 or B 52 in the Laura catalogue. Therefore Mr. Wathen and myself while staying in the Laura last July took the opportunity of photographing all that remains of the Gospels in this MS. The technical description given by Dr. Gregory on p. 445 of the Prolegomena is correct and complete, but an examination of the text from the photographs gives the opportunity of forming some opinion as to its character and value.

It will be remembered that the only facts as to the text of the Gospels which Dr. Gregory noted are that Ψ has the 'shorter conclusion' of Mark, and omits the *pericope adulterae*. So far as my investigations have gone they show that the text of Mark is far more valuable than that of Luke and John—Matthew and Mark i 1–ix 4 being missing—and therefore the present note only deals with the Marcan text.

The first question which one naturally asks is whether there are any signs of '*distinctively Syrian*' readings. There would appear to be none which are certain. The two variants which have least claim to be pre-Syrian may well be Alexandrian[2].

It is therefore certain that we have to deal with a text of which the basis is pre-Syrian.

Now in a MS with a pre-Syrian base, of which the only known fact is the possession of the 'shorter conclusion,' one expects to find readings of a 'Western' type similar to those in *k* or in Syr$^{\text{hl-mg}}$, or 'Alexandrian' ones similar to those in L, since the attestation of the 'shorter conclusion' is L 274^{mg}, *k* syr$^{\text{hl-mg}}$ boh$^{\text{cod}}$ aeth$^{\text{codd}}$, and a fragment similar in text to L found on Mt. Sinai by Dr. Rendel Harris.

---

[1] Extant only in the ancient Armenian version. I quote from the Latin translation of the Mechitarists, p. 119.

[2] x 29 + *ἢ γυναῖκα ante ἢ τέκνα cum* A C N codd. ser.: xiii 32 *οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ cum* A C Δ codd. ser.

Examination proves the existence of the *Western* element in 34 variants (without counting readings which are both Western and Syrian), of which the three most interesting are :—

(1) ix 49 ἀναλωθήσεται *pro* πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται. Cf. *k* consumitur.

(2) xiii 11 μὴ προσμελετᾶτε *pro* μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε, *cum* Syr^{sin}; an interesting example of the recovery of the other part of the conflation found in the late MSS, viz. μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε μηδὲ μελετᾶτε (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε, *sine addit.* ℵBDL 1–209 33).

(3) xv 3 + αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο, *cum* ΔNU 13–69–124 33 al pauc., *a c* syr^{sin} arm sah^{ming}, Orig., where the attestation suggests that the reading, though undoubtedly early Western, was also an Alexandrian one, a phenomenon which occurs in at least eleven other instances in Ψ. It may also be noted that the combination Ψ syr^{sin} against all Greek MSS and the Latins occurs five times (x 39; xi 21; xi 27; xiii 11; xv 26).

Going on to see whether there are any purely *Alexandrian* readings, again omitting to notice those in which the late MSS have adopted the variant, we find that there are sixteen readings of this nature, which are neither Neutral, Western, or Syrian, to be added to the eleven Western-Alexandrian readings mentioned above. Of these the most interesting are :—

(1) ix 43 *om.* εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, *cum* ℵ^{ca} L Δ min^3, pesh pers^p, where the text again presents signs of conflation, for we get (i) εἰς τὴν γέενναν, *sine addit.* ℵ^{ca} LΔΨ pesh. al^{pauc}; (ii) εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, *sine addit.* 1–118–209 28, Syr^{sin}; (iii) both phrases, ℵBD and all late MSS.

(2) x 27 *om.* πάντα γὰρ δύνατα παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, *cum* Δ 1–209 157 69 1071, Clem-Al.

The question then arises whether there are also traces of the other pre-Syrian element—the *Neutral.* To investigate this point clearly would be a long and tedious process, but there is little question that there are a considerable number of purely Neutral readings in Ψ in Mark, probably about as many 'non-Alexandrian Neutral' as there are 'non-Neutral Alexandrian.' Perhaps the two most remarkable facts are that Ψ agrees with B boh. in the various readings connected with the cock-crowing in chap. xiv, and that it agrees with ℵB 48^{ev} go. in omitting καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ in x 7.

Are there any *peculiar* readings worthy of comment? Altogether there seem to be 30 unique readings, most of which are obvious blunders. It is probably possible to deduce the length of the line in one of the archetypes of Ψ from a comparison of two of these—the only ones of any size :—

(1) ix 20 *om.* καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα

(2) ix 28 *tr.* κατ' ἰδίαν *ante* εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

where the length of line suggested is about the same, 20–22 letters: and it is also just possible that in xiv 56 the reading κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ for κατ᾿ αὐτοῦ is due to the occurrence of κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 75 letters previously, i. e. at the beginning of the fourth preceding line[1].

Some interest also attaches to the following :—

(1) xiv 1 ἦν δὲ τὰ ἄζυμα καὶ τὸ πάσχα *pro* τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα : cf. Syr$^{\text{sin}}$ = τὰ ἄζυμα τοῦ πάσχα.

(2) xiv 47 ἀρχιερέως καιάφα καὶ ἀφεῖλεν, where the insertion of the name is a pretty case of dittography and curious coincidence.

(3) xiv 49 ἐκρατεῖτε *pro* ἐκρατήσατε. Cf. B's 'singular' reading ἐκράτει.

The foregoing will give some idea of the character of the text of Ψ in Mark, but it may be well to add that of the readings which are pre-Syrian and Syrian, but not found in the Neutral text, seven are Western and Syrian, ten are Alexandrian and Syrian, eight are Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian—twenty-five in all; and of these thirteen are found in D, nine in ℵ, fourteen in Δ, and ten in L.

We may therefore say with some confidence that in Mark Ψ gives us a pre-Syrian text of which the basis is Alexandrian (in the widest sense), while a number of the readings are Western. The interesting question is, how did these Western readings get into an Alexandrian MS? On this point it may be observed that the Western element is not a late one, for the majority of the Western readings found in Ψ are among those which were rejected by the late texts. It is an early ancestor of Ψ who has left us the Western readings. This makes us think of the Biblical text of Clement, and raises the suspicion that it may not be necessary to go outside Alexandria in tracing the ancestry of Ψ. Certainly Cyril and Origen give us adequate evidence for the use of the Alexandrian and Neutral types of text. Can we go on to say that the early Western element in the ℵCLΔΨ group is to be used as evidence for the early pre-Origenistic Western text of Alexandria, of which the quotations in Clement prove the existence but do not define the limits?

K. Lake.

---

[1] Another case would be x 23 *tr.* εἰσελεύσονται *ante* εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (20 letters): but as Clem. Al. has the same transposition, it may be a case of an early *varia lectio*.

REVIEWS

CODEX BEZAE.

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine, sumptibus Academiae phototypice repraesentatus (Cantabrigiae, MDCCCXCIX).

THE policy of reproducing important manuscripts by means of photography is now well established in principle, and is rapidly being adopted in practice. Besides papyri, of which all the most important have been so reproduced, complete facsimiles already exist of the best MSS of Æschylus, Sophocles, Plato, and Demosthenes, and of two of the most important copies of Virgil and Horace, while several others are in preparation. Of Biblical MSS, two of the three great Greek Bibles, the Alexandrinus and the Vaticanus, have been completely photographed; so have two of the most valuable MSS of the Old Testament, the Sarravianus and the Marchalianus; and now the list is increased by the most important of the MSS which contain the New Testament alone, the Codex Bezae.

Of the value of such a system of reproductions there can be no doubt. With certain reservations, to be mentioned below, it secures the testimony of the MS from destruction through any disaster less widespread than a cataclysm involving the civilization of Europe, America, and Australia. Secondly, it enables scholars at a distance from the home of the MS to ascertain its evidence on almost all points without the trouble or expense of a journey, and without depending upon the goodwill or the competence of a friend or librarian on the spot. Thirdly,—and this is a consideration which will appeal, even more than the last, to librarians —it saves the original MS from much handling. The vellum of ancient manuscripts, as Father Ehrle has recently been reminding us, is often in a very precarious state, and much handling is apt to increase the damage which the corrosion of the ink has caused. Now out of every five applications that have to be made to the testimony of the MS, four, probably, can be equally well answered by the facsimile; and the life of the original is correspondingly prolonged.

In some respects, however, even the best photographic facsimiles fail adequately to replace the original. Where the surface of the original is much damaged, and the writing seriously faded or defaced, it is dangerous to trust wholly to the evidence of a facsimile. It is said, and with some truth, that photography brings out traces which the unaided eye cannot discern; but photography can deceive as well as instruct. Slight stains or discolorations in the vellum are often indistinguishable from ink in a photograph; and if the facsimile may suggest possibilities of decipherment, it is only the original that can pronounce final judgement upon them. No doubt this applies especially to papyri, the colour and texture of which lay various traps in the way of the sun's portraiture; but it also applies, to some extent, to vellum MSS. Further, a facsimile is inadequate to determine accurately the various correctors' hands which so often play an important part in the testimony of a manuscript. Some correctors are discernible enough by the shapes of their characters; but often the colour of the ink is the decisive criterion, and here photography is almost useless. The dating of a manuscript can usually be accomplished sufficiently well by means of a complete facsimile (not always by a facsimile of a single page), though even here it is preferable to examine the original; but the discrimination of corrections (especially small ones) can only be very imperfectly performed from a photograph.

Nevertheless, a good facsimile can do much, though it cannot do all; and the recent facsimile of the Codex Bezae ranks with the best that have hitherto been produced of any manuscript. The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have at all times showed themselves liberal in their endeavours to make the contents of the great treasure of their University Library available to all students; and the present photographic reproduction (by Dujardin heliotype) completes and supersedes the editions in uncial type by Kipling (1793) and in ordinary type by Scrivener (1864). Supersedes them, that is to say, in regard to the actual presentation of the text of the MS, for of prolegomena there is practically nothing; and for a description of the MS, a discussion of its date and character, and an enumeration of the various correctors and their works, the student must still have recourse to the admirable edition of Scrivener. He can have recourse to it, however, with this advantage, that whereas hitherto he has been obliged to accept Scrivener's statements with blind confidence, he can now test them in many respects by the evidence of his own eyes and the use of his own judgement.

With regard to the actual readings of the manuscript, it is not likely that anything will be added to Scrivener's work; for, in addition to his own care in transcribing the text, he was able to compare his results with those of his predecessors—with the edition of Kipling and the collations of Ussher, Mill, Wetstein, and Bentley. Only a minute examination could show whether any errors remain in Scrivener's text, and it is not in the least probable that the results of such an examination would be at all proportionate to the labour. The points on which we may look for fresh information from the publication of the facsimile are rather palaeographical, since these are questions of judgement rather than of fact, and other students may at least prefer to exercise their own judgement, whether they would rely on it in opposition to Scrivener's or not.

The palaeographical questions which have to be answered are, in the first place, as to the date of the original writing, and secondly the distinction and dates of the various correctors. On the first subject there is little to be said. The specimen facsimiles of Codex Bezae, published by the Palaeographical Society and elsewhere, have made its appearance familiar to palaeographers, and there is a general agreement in assigning it to the sixth century. The only remark that need be made on this is that, for want of materials, the precise dating of early uncial hands must still be regarded as somewhat precarious, and that the question is complicated in the case of Codex Bezae by the fact that neither its Greek nor its Latin hand is wholly natural. Written, as its bilingual character shows, in a country of mixed languages, and probably remote from the great literary centres, its writing shows an unevenness, and even an awkwardness, which places it a little outside the normal course of palaeographic development. Roughness and irregularity of writing are generally taken as signs of degeneration from an earlier and better form ; but they may also be due to inexperience in a scribe contemporary with the better style but at a distance from the centres in which it is practised. This may reasonably be the case with Codex Bezae ; and if evidence were to come to light which pushed it into the fifth century, palaeographers could accept it without difficulty. Provisionally, however, a date in the sixth century must be regarded as more probable.

The corrections in the MS are fairly numerous, and they have been minutely studied by Scrivener. It cannot, however, be said that they are very important. The earlier corrections are comparatively few and trifling, representing the removal of scribal errors rather than variations of text, while the later ones lack authority. Scrivener distinguishes nine hands as employed in correcting the text, besides four or five who are responsible for the liturgical annotations in the margin. With regard to the first five of these (Scrivener's A to E) it cannot be said that the facsimile is of much assistance. The work of all these correctors is confined to alterations of the smallest kind, consisting of the insertion or superposition of one or two letters of a size so small that their individualities are difficult to determine. In cases such as these, so much depends upon the appearance of the ink that it is impossible to speak with any confidence except after a prolonged examination of the original; so far as the facsimile goes, the corrections of A and B are often quite indistinguishable, and the same is the case, as even Scrivener is inclined to admit, with C and E. An editor may easily be too precise in his discernment of different hands in such small alterations as these, through not allowing for the fluctuations to which the handwriting of the same individual is liable; but the decision must be made from an inspection of the original, not of a photograph.

The contributions of the remaining correctors are more substantial and more individual; and here the facsimile sometimes leads us to question Scrivener's judgement very gravely. F, for instance, who has occasionally added whole words or even clauses at the ends of lines, is placed by him vaguely between the eighth and the eleventh century, though he may very well have belonged to the seventh; while G, who has written two whole lines in each language at the foot of ff. 59 b and 60, in a hand of about the seventh century, is assigned by him to the eleventh. This is a somewhat important instance, since G is the most active corrector of the Latin text; it would appear also that G must be earlier than F, since no notice is taken by him, in his corrections of the Latin, of the additions made by F to the Greek text. Why Scrivener should have thrust G down so low, it is impossible to imagine. The Latin hand is of a well-marked character, with well-known forms of the letters *g*, *r*, and *s*, which there is no reason to place later than the seventh century; while the Greek, though of a less familiar type (especially at the time when Scrivener wrote), is in a hand to which there are many parallels in the papyri of the Byzantine period, in the sixth and seventh centuries.

The dating of the correctors' hands in this particular MS does not happen to be of great importance with regard to textual questions, since the alterations rarely represent a collation with another copy; but it is of some interest in respect of the history and *provenance* of the MS. We have here the phenomenon of a manuscript written in both Greek and Latin, consequently for a community in which both these tongues were known, but in which (it is fair to assume) Latin was the vernacular language; for in a country where Greek predominated, even though Latin also were known, a Greek book would naturally be left in its native tongue, without the accompaniment of a translation. The addition of a translation almost necessarily implies that the language into which the translation is made is the vernacular of the country in which it is produced, though the original tongue is sufficiently well known to make the retention of it useful. Under such conditions one would expect subsequent alterations and additions to be rather in the language of the country than in the foreign tongue of the original; but with the Codex Bezae the contrary is the case. The only corrector who has done much to the Latin side is G, and he has also retouched the Greek in several places and with an assured hand. Still more noticeable is it that the liturgical notes in the margin are in Greek, the Latin being left unmarked; and these liturgical notes are the latest insertion in the MS of any importance. As Scrivener has shown, they cannot be earlier than the ninth century, since on f. 150 b one of them incorporates a previously existing note which is in a well-marked sloping hand of that date; and they may more probably be assigned to the tenth. Their Greek is rough and bad enough to prove, if any further proof were wanting, that they do not proceed from a country where Greek was habitually written; but they show that the Greek New Testament was still read in the services of the church in which this copy was used. If Scrivener's date for the corrector G were right, we should have to suppose the same state of things prolonged into the eleventh or twelfth century, which would increase the difficulty of identifying the locality. Hence it is of some importance to clear this apparent evidence away; and the problem so left should not ultimately be incapable of solution.

Countries in which the conditions just described are known to have existed are not numerous. Egypt, which was at one time suggested as the original home of Codex Bezae, is out of the question; of all the oldest MSS of the Greek Bible this is the one in which it is least possible to detect Egyptian characteristics. The most obvious locality possessing the requisite bilingual qualifications is Southern Italy, where Greek was certainly read and written throughout the period covered by the dates of this MS and its correctors. Indeed Greek was so much at home there as to tell against the assignment of Codex Bezae to this neighbourhood, since one would then expect its writing to be more of the ordinary type of Greek uncial than it is. Its rough and peculiar characters, strangely similar to the Latin on the opposite page, can hardly have been written in a region where trained Greek scribes were at home. If any bilingual MS is to be assigned to Southern Italy (and this is questionable), it would rather be the Codex Claromontanus, with its skilled calligraphic regularity, than Codex Bezae. Far more probable, as is now generally recognized, is Southern Gaul, the church of the Greek missionaries Pothinus and Irenaeus, the church in which Greek liturgical uses continued far into the Middle Ages, and for which at least one Greek lectionary is known to have been written as late as the year 1022 (Evst. 60). It is some confirmation of this belief, that it was at Lyons that the MS first came to light in modern times; but not much, since we have many instances of manuscripts travelling considerable distances during the Middle Ages. Thus the Codex Laudianus (E of the Acts) journeyed from Sardinia to England, the Codex Amiatinus from England to Italy, the copy from which St. Cuthbert's Gospels was derived from

Naples to Lindisfarne. Similarly the Codex Bezae may have travelled to Lyons from some other home; and the mention of the Laudianus suggests another possible origin. Sardinia would provide the necessary bilingual surroundings, and (as the Laudianus shows, if it was really written there) the Greek writing of that island would be likely enough to be rough and inelegant; but the output of Greek Bibles would hardly have been very large there, and the chances are greatly in favour of the larger and more important Church on the Gallic mainland. The principal difficulty connected with this theory is the uncertainty as to the extent to which the Greek language and liturgy continued in use so late as the tenth century; and on this point additional evidence is much to be desired.

Such are the impressions which a first examination of the two noble volumes in which the facsimile is enshrined leave upon the mind. There is nothing very new or startling suggested by it, nothing more important than some doubts as to the accuracy of some of the dates assigned by Scrivener to the correctors' hands. Fuller examination, wider knowledge, or a happier instinct may reveal more; and yet it is hardly likely that the skilled students who have formerly examined the original MS have left much for their successors to glean. The great gain to be derived from the facsimile is the increase in accessibility, as well as insurance against danger, which it gives to the testimony of the MS. For this reason all students of the sacred text are bound to be grateful to the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press for the liberality with which they have undertaken so expensive a work, and the high standard of technical execution which has been attained under their direction.

One last consideration rises inevitably to the mind. The Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Vaticanus, and the Codex Bezae have now been reproduced by photography: where is the one remaining manuscript which is worthy to rank with these, the Codex Sinaiticus? The libraries of London and Cambridge have always been accessible to students, and the library of the Vatican is so now, thanks to the enlightened policy of the present Pontiff and his admirable librarian; but a journey to St. Petersburg is not within the reach of all. There are many points on which an examination of the Sinaiticus is desirable —notably as to the identity of one of its scribes with the scribe of the Vaticanus, for which the evidence hitherto adduced is not wholly convincing; the correctors' hands, moreover, are unusually important in this manuscript. It is therefore much to be wished that the Russian Government, which has recently shown its liberality in the acquisition of the remains of the *codex purpureus* N, would allow its greatest manuscript treasure to be reproduced in photographic facsimile. It has been remarked that the three most valuable manuscripts of the Greek Bible are in the possession of the three principal branches of the Christian Church. The Anglican and the Roman Churches have made their treasures accessible to the whole world; will not the Eastern Church also take its part in this amicable rivalry in the pursuit of truth and sound knowledge?

F. G. KENYON.

HORT ON 1 PETER.

The First Epistle of St. Peter i 1—ii 17; *the Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and additional Notes.* By the late F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (Macmillan, 1898.)

THE publication of this fragment, says Bishop Westcott in his Preface, 'cannot but cause the keenest regret as being only a fragment; yet it is sufficiently varied in its contents to give an adequate view of Dr. Hort's method, and to indicate and justify lines of inquiry which may be pursued fruitfully, and,' the Bishop trusts, 'to remove some misunderstandings of passages in his other books.' The interest of a posthumous publication is, as a rule, twofold. It contributes to our knowledge partly of the subject, partly of the author. In the former respect, it suffers from the circumstances of its publication; incompleteness, and lack of finality as to the results the writer would have wished to leave on record as his own, necessarily attend a book of this kind. But this does not apply to its biographical interest. Dr. Hort's was a mind whose workings it is an education to follow, and even where the process is arrested, we welcome anything that makes it accessible to ourselves.

The Commentary on St. Peter is a fragment of the great scheme of New Testament Commentary of which Lightfoot's great Pauline Commentaries and Westcott's Gospel and Epistles of St. John are the only complete outcome.

The three friends, widely as they differed in mental idiosyncrasy, were agreed in the fundamental principle of a strictly historical exegesis. Only if the New Testament 'be interpreted as any other book,' was an appreciation to be gained of its unique character as 'containing all things necessary to salvation.' Within the limits of this common aim there was room for differing application of principle. 'One looked primarily to the vivid realisation of the original meaning of the text, another to the determination of the elements of philosophical theology which it contained, another to the correspondences of different parts of the apostolic records which suggests the fulness of the vital harmony by which they are united.' In the second of these three aims we have an authoritative formula for Hort's predominant interest in the work of exegesis; and brief in compass as it is, the Commentary now published fully illustrates the description. It does not appear when Dr. Hort first began to work at St. Peter. After the great plan was agreed upon in 1860, he was for some time engaged upon the synoptic Gospels, then upon St. James. His first Lectures on St. Peter were given in 1882; his last (the last lectures delivered during his life) in Easter term, 1892. These dates imply that nothing which has appeared since the last-named date is discussed in the present volume. Little of first-rate importance has been added during this period to the Commentaries upon 1 Peter. But Prof. Ramsay's work on the Church and the Roman Empire appeared in 1893, and it would have added very greatly to the interest of Dr. Hort's volume, had it been possible to learn his views on the questions affecting the Epistle which Prof. Ramsay raises. This is especially true of the question of date. We know from Prof. Ramsay that he had the advantage of stating his main contentions to Dr. Hort in conversation, and that Dr. Hort was prepared, in view of the absence of any really trustworthy tradition as to the date of St. Peter's death, to entertain the idea that 1 Peter might date, as Ramsay suggested, from about the year 80, and none the less be the genuine work of the Apostle. But the volume before us essentially belongs to the time before the question was placed upon its present footing.

The same holds good of the very careful discussion, in the only finished 'additional note' which the volume contains, of the provinces of Asia Minor to which the Epistle is addressed. The discussion is very full and accurate, and the important conclusion to which it leads, that the order of enumeration is the natural order in which a messenger landing at, and returning to, a port in the Euxine, probably Sinope, would traverse the then Roman provinces of the interior, is of permanent value. But the discussion represents the state of knowledge in 1882, and would need to be supplemented and modified in view of subsequent researches and discussions by Mommsen and others, including Ramsay. That the Churches of Asia Minor are classified according to the Roman provinces, and not according to the non-Roman tribal divisions, is an important point, made clear by Hort, and thoroughly in harmony with Ramsay's results. But we still read (p. 158, note) that 'Lightfoot has fully proved that [St. Paul's Galatians] were true Galatians, not Phrygian, Pisidian, or Lycaonian inhabitants of the Roman province' of Galatia. Probably Prof. Ramsay is right in inferring, from language used by Hort in his lectures on Romans and

Ephesians, that the note in question does not represent the view he entertained at the end of his life. If so, it is perhaps undesirable to enter more fully upon the details of introduction treated in the Essay and in the brief Introductory Lecture, and to confine our attention to the Commentary, in which the permanent interest of the book really centres. It is very tantalising to miss the light which Dr. Hort could have thrown on many passages of the Epistle. The great passage which speaks of Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison; the principal references to persecution; the word ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος; 'our adversary the devil,' 'the Spirit of Glory and of God'—these are only a few of the points as to which we are left to deplore the much that might have been. But what we have is of priceless value. The thoroughness and brilliancy of philological illustration brought to bear on words and constructions, the theological subtlety and suggestiveness which surprise us everywhere, more than justify the verdict of Bishop Westcott quoted above.

To review without lapsing into discontinuous jottings a commentary equal in scale to that of Lightfoot on Colossians is difficult. The difficulty is increased when, as in 1 Peter, the notorious *cruces* are few, and those which there are fall mainly outside the limits of the fragment dealt with. But perhaps the most remarkable thing about the Commentary is its revelation of real *cruces*. We are all familiar with the undergraduate's distinction between the genius of two of Cambridge's greatest teachers—the function of the one was to make difficult things seem easy, of the other to make easy things seem difficult. In this Commentary, if nowhere else, Dr. Hort associates himself with the function last named. We somehow think of 1 Peter as one of the easier Epistles. But after reading and digesting Dr. Hort's wonderful notes we begin to wonder where our eyes have been. As a specimen, taken almost at random, the reader may refer to chap. i 23, 24, 'born again, not of corruptible seed . . . and the flower wasteth.' Step by step, with careful induction of all contributory sources of light, we advance from the idea of new creation, the Petrine reflex of St. Paul's καινὴ κτίσις, through the consideration of the source, the seed 'imparted by a continuous and perpetual sowing,' with 'the word of a living and abiding God' (so Dr. Hort connects, see Dan. vi 26) as its instrument. What, then, is the 'word'? Going back to James i 18 ('a passage which was probably in St. Peter's mind'), which refers to the original creation of man as not merely a creation but 'a Divine begetting, a word or utterance of God entering into man and making him capable of apprehending truth,' Dr. Hort finds this passage linked to the other by the thought that the new birth is a restoration of that which was at the beginning, so that the Christian, and he alone, is the true man.

Then, in the midst of a wealth of idea and illustration to which it is impossible to do justice by selection, and after an illuminating retrospect upon the previous context (ver. 22; 'it is the life of God in man which raises the love of man for man to its highest power'), we come to the real surprise of the passage in the quotation from Isaiah. Former commentators either see in it, with Alford, merely a confirmation of the abidingness of the word of the Lord, or (with von Soden) see nothing worthy of comment. In any case the withering grass and the fading flower are treated merely as the foils to the enduring Word of God.

But Hort, by patiently unravelling every strand of association, shows how materially the quotation enriches the main thought of the passage. 'All flesh' is of course free from the Pauline associations of σάρξ—'human life' would perhaps come near to expressing its meaning—the 'glory' of it is not the καύχησις of sinful flesh, but the δόξα (LXX for חֶסֶד), the winning, attractive side of life. 'Such [as the drying up of the juices of the grass] would soon be found the drying up of the life which seemed to animate the heathen mode of existence.' . . . 'To see the full force of the image we must remember the brilliancy of the flowers which shine among the thin short-lived grass of spring in the Levant, such as anemones, tulips, and poppies. "Of all the ordinary aspects of the country" of Palestine, says Stanley, "this blaze of scarlet colour is perhaps the most peculiar."' The thought at the bottom of this exegesis is that of a lower and transitory life conquered, purified, and immortalised by the introduction, as it were, into the veins of mankind of a higher and Divine life. This conception, the revived prominence of which is a return of modern theology to the categories of the Greek Fathers, naturally somewhat relieves, in those who accept it, the importunity with which theology has interrogated Scripture and reason for a theory of the Atonement which shall by itself suffice as an answer to the question, *Cur deus homo?*

We trace this correlation of ideas very clearly in some passages of Dr. Hort's Commentary, notably on i 18, 19, ἐλυτρώθητε . . . ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. 'The idea of the whole passage is a simple one, deliverance through the payment of a costly ransom by another. On two further questions connected with it St. Peter here is silent, who it was that made the payment, and to whom it was made.' As to the first of these questions, Dr. Hort rightly points out that to speak both of Christ Himself and of the Father as the Ransomer, is perfectly consistent. As to the latter, he considers that the patristic idea of a ransom paid to the devil involves less serious difficulties than the medieval and modern doctrine that it was paid to the Father. If the reader, in addition to the above passages, will consult those on prophecy, the Church, the relation of Christianity to Judaism, and other important subjects, to which Bishop Westcott draws attention in his Preface, he will be in a position not only to verify the Bishop's above-quoted characterization of Hort's dominant exegetical interest, but also to re-echo his verdict that the Notes 'require patient and reflective study.'

From his notes, coupled with the outline Lecture of 'Orientation,' which is all that he left by way of Introduction, it is clear that Dr. Hort accepted frankly and without reserve the literary dependence of this Epistle upon those of St. Paul, especially Romans and Ephesians, and probably upon that of St. James as well. He is also clear that the readers were the Gentile Christians, largely of St Paul's making, of Asia Minor, and that the words of i 1 are applicable to them by analogy only. He was, moreover, as we have said, prepared, on the ground of the political position of the Christians which the Epistle presupposes, to allow it to be brought down to a date long after the traditional date of St. Paul's death. As tradition (of a kind) associates the two apostles more or less closely in their death, the above conclusions will appear to some a halfway house on the road to an 'abjudication' of our Epistle from St. Peter altogether. It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Hort did not live to give us his complete mind on the subject. But, so far as we can go behind the bare summary of points in the introductory lecture, which amount to little more than a dismissal of the arguments from persecution and from literary dependence, as inconclusive in the face of strong external attestation, it would seem that Dr. Hort's real belief that we have here the words, not of an 'Epigone,' but of a protagonist of the apostolic band found its roots in the results of minute and comprehensive study of the text. That 1 Peter represents a step in the process by which Pauline ideas passed into the common consciousness of a Christendom, incapable of fully understanding the δυσνόητα of St. Paul himself, may now be taken as agreed. That the Epistle contains much Pauline matter is manifest; that Weiss' theory of Pauline borrowing from St. Peter deserves, as Hort says, no discussion is equally plain. That the most difficult Pauline conceptions are either missing, or appear in a much simplified form, in 1 Peter, all students of St. Paul must realize. That the Epistle contains much matter not strictly Pauline will be apparent to the unprejudiced student. The examination of this latter element is probably the internal test by which the final estimate of the apostolic rank of the Epistle must be formed. And here it is that Dr. Hort has carried the matter really forward. Working, in accord with the spirit of true criticism, with a *praeiudicium* in favour of the text being what it professes to be, he has found in it everywhere the genuine ring of originality, not the meaningless platitudes of the mere compiler of a pseudepigraphon. And surely he is right. But would that we had the whole!

A. Robertson.

CHRONICLE

ARCHAEOLOGICA.

The *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, in which for more than thirty years Giovanni Battista de Rossi had given to the world the results of his researches in the field of Christian Archaeology, and, more particularly, his discoveries in the Roman Catacombs, came to an end in 1894. After his death, some of his disciples determined to continue the periodical in the same shape under the title of the *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana.* The first number appeared in 1895, and since then four numbers have been produced regularly every year. The scope of the publication is to give (1) an official account of the progress made by the (Papal) *Commissione di sacra archeologia* in exploring the Catacombs, (2) reports of the monthly meetings of the Roman *Società di sacra archeologia* and of other meetings of the same character, (3) original articles on subjects connected with Christian archaeology, and (4) short notices of discoveries outside Rome (including the East), together with reviews of books relating to the subject. The numbers, it may be added, are liberally illustrated. The original editors were Michele Stefano de Rossi, Armellini, Marucchi, and Stevenson. Armellini was removed by death in 1896, and the deaths of Stevenson and Michele de Rossi in 1898 left Marucchi the only surviving member of the original board. He has now been joined by Father Bonavenia, Mgr. Crostarosa, G. Gatti, R. Kanzler, and Mgr. Wilpert. It may be useful to give a short *résumé* of the principal articles which have appeared up to the present time.

1895. ARMELLINI. Discoveries in the Catacomb of St. Hermes in 1894.—MARUCCHI. The Abercius inscription. Maintains the orthodox view against Ficker's attempt to prove the pagan character of the inscription.—GRISAR. 'Una scuola classica di marmorarii medievali.' Two important articles showing that a series of churches in Umbria (the best known of which are San Salvatore at Spoleto, and the Temple of the Clitumnus), hitherto assigned to the fourth and fifth centuries, are really works of the twelfth century, based on the study of classical models.—CROSTAROSA. The Mosaic in Sta. Pudenziana. The buildings in the background represent the *Domus Pudentiana*, as it appeared in the fourth century. We can trace the Basilica, Baptistery, and residence of the Bishop of Rome (before the removal to the Lateran).—STEVENSON. A chamber with *graffiti* in the Catacomb of St. Cyriaca. An attempt to bring this into relation with early and mediaeval accounts of the sanctuaries of this area. Further excavation is necessary.—KANZLER. Restoration (with plate) of the tomb of SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus (Catacomb of Pretextatus) as it was in the fourth century.

1896. MARUCCHI. Recent discoveries in the Cathedral of Parenzo in Istria. Below the floor of the existing church rebuilt by Eufrasius in the sixth century have been found (1) portions of the pavement of the fourth-century basilica which preceded it; (2) a mosaic apparently belonging to a Roman house of the second or third century, probably the place of meeting of the earliest Christian congregation in Parentium, and possibly connected with the martyr bishop Maurus, the patron of Parenzo.—LE BLANT. The Acts of St. Phileas.—ROHAULT DE FLEURY. Church of St. Andrew in the Vatican.—CROSTAROSA. The stamps on the roof-tiles of Sta. Maria Maggiore. The great preponderance, among the ancient tiles, of tiles of the classical period supports the idea that Liberius only adapted the existing Basilica Sicinini. The remainder of the ancient tiles (about one in four) bear the mark X M Γ, hitherto only found (except in isolated cases) in Syria, which De Rossi proved to be the initials of Christ and the two archangels. They belong to the fourth century, and may be due to an extensive restoration of the roof by Damasus after the damage inflicted during the attack on the partisans of Ursicinus.—MICHELE DE ROSSI. New epitaphs from the Catacomb of St. Hermes.—SAVIO. Churches in Milan before the time of Ambrose.—LEFORT maintains, against De Rossi and Crostarosa, that the two female figures in the mosaic of Sta. Pudenziana represent the Church of the Circumcision and the Church of the Gentiles.

1897. GRISAR. Notes on the Exhibition of Sacred Art at Orvieto (Oct. 1896).—STEVENSON. Mosaic pavement from the ruined Christian basilica at Madaba in Palestine, representing a map of the Holy Places. If the church shown at Betabara is that erected by Anastasius between the fifth and sixth centuries, a date is given for the original from which the mosaic has been copied.—MARUCCHI. Fragment of a sarcophagus from the Basilica of St. Valentinus with a symbolical representation of St. Paul and Thecla.—CROSTAROSA. Progress of exploration in the Catacombs, 1894–96.—SAVIO. The spurious letter of St. Ambrose giving an account of the discovery of the bodies of SS. Gervasius and Protasius was probably composed at Ravenna.—STEVENSON. Results of recent exploration in the Catacombs of Domitilla.—CROSTAROSA. The stamps on the roof-tiles of San Martino ai Monti. The construction of the roof has been little altered and may go back to the time of

Symmachus. A large proportion of the tiles come from Imperial factories which were probably in the Vatican district.—GIOVENALE. Sta. Cecilia in Trastevere. Excavations in 1892 made in the courtyard in front of the church revealed traces of a Roman house, and also an *impluvium*. The latter was about halfway between the church and the street, and not in the centre of the court but to the left. It no doubt belonged to the Christian basilica, and the marble *cantharus* which still stands in the court may have been its fountain. A drawing by Antonio Sangallo gives two *canthari* from St. Cecilia, the second apparently being that now at the entrance of the Museo delle Terme. If this be true, there may have been two fountains in the atrium of St. Cecilia, one on the right and the other on the left.—STEVENSON. Account of a Vatican MS (fifteenth century) which contains in an appendix to the Constantinian *Regiones Urbis Romae* a catalogue of the Christian cemeteries in a form which is apparently not later than the end of the fourth century.—STEVENSON. The topography of the Via Ostiensis with special reference to the burial-place of St. Paul. The works connected with laying the great sewer along the modern Via Ostiense have made it clear that it is identical with the ancient Via Ostiensis. The latter therefore separated the Basilica of St. Paul from the hill to the east, which has never been cut away. The cemetery of Lucina was not a catacomb, but an open-air burial-ground between the road and the Tiber. The original tomb of St. Paul was probably a small *cella* above ground in this area.

1898. STEVENSON. Continuation of the above. Further excavations have completely confirmed the conclusions previously arrived at. A row of tombs has been found on the left of the road facing the apse of the present basilica. The Constantinian church opened on to the road, and it was because extension in this direction was impossible that Valentinian reversed the orientation of the basilica. The tomb of the Apostle did not face the main road, but one which branched off in a slanting direction towards the river. Traces of it were found behind the apse of Constantine's church.—BONAVENIA. Cemetery of Basilla. The crypt of SS. Protus and Hyacinthus.—MARUCCHI. A mosaic pavement (twelfth century) in the ruined church of Sta. Maria at Ganagobia (Basses Alpes).—MONTI. The church of San Giovanni in Argentella near Palombara Sabina. The church is of the eleventh or early twelfth century, and retains much of its original appearance.—MARUCCHI. Identification of the crypt in which SS. Peter and Marcellinus were buried near the Via Labicana. The walls have *graffiti* of pilgrims. The remains of an oratory (now restored) above ground probably belonged to the tomb of St. Tiburtius. No traces have yet been discovered of the Constantinian Basilica of SS. Peter and Marcellinus, which must not be confused with the existing Mausoleum of Helena (Tor pignattara).—BOURBAN. Account of excavations at St. Maurice (Valais), the ancient Agaunum, in connexion with the church and monastery founded in honour of St. Maurice and the Theban Legion. The results will be given in a future number.—Two articles by one of the 'Pères blancs.' (1) Attempt to identify the martyrs buried in a basilica recently discovered at Lambaesis. (2) Fragment, apparently part of the epitaph of Honoratus, bishop of Sicilibba, found in the ruins of the basilica at Damous-el-Karita.

1899. Fasc. 1 and 2. MARUCCHI gives further details about the subterranean chapel recently discovered at Tor Marancia on the Via Ardeatina, which may be safely identified with the tomb of the martyrs Marcus and Marcellianus. Some fragments of a Damasine inscription from SS. Cosma e Damiano, which De Rossi connected with SS. John and Paul, more probably belonged to Marcus and Marcellianus and came to S. Cosma when the bodies of the martyrs were transferred thither about the ninth century.—Recently discovered inscriptions from the Basilicas of S. Petronilla and SS. Nereus and Achilles (Via Ardeatina). The most important is a fragmentary epitaph giving numerous relationships of the deceased with ecclesiastics.—WILPERT. A fresco (fourth century) in the Catacomb of Domitilla, generally interpreted as a preaching scene, probably represents two souls before the judgement seat of Christ, introduced by their patron saints.—MARUCCHI describes the plan and attempts to identify the chief buildings in the city of Jerusalem as represented on the (sixth century) mosaic of Madaba.—UN MISSIONNAIRE DES PÈRES BLANCS. (1) The early fifth century basilica at Theveste was apparently constructed so as to reproduce the chief arrangements of the Temple at Jerusalem. This is fairly made out. (2) Restoration of an inscription from Mascula relating to the martyr Emeritus.—BOURBAN. Excavations at St. Maurice (continuation). The chief results are the discovery of the foundations of the early church and of some epitaphs, the most important being that of St. Vultchaire (Wilchar), bishop of Sion (eighth century), an account of which is promised in a later number.—TOMASSETTI suggests that the local name *ad inphalatos* (al. *insalatos*), which occurs in ancient lists of the Roman cemeteries on the Via Portuensis, is a corruption of *ad infulatos*, and refers to the Persian martyrs, Abdon and Sennen, whose *memoria* was apparently close by, and who are known to have been represented as wearing the *infula* or mitre.—Among the 'Notizie' are accounts of various discoveries in Rome, Naples, Jerusalem, &c. Marucchi draws attention to the project of the French School at Athens to produce a Corpus of Greek Christian inscriptions. There is an announcement of the second International Congress of Christian Archaeology to be held at Rome in April, 1900. The Abbé Duchesne is president of the committee.

Le Forum Chrétien, by the Abbé L. Duchesne (Rome, Imprimerie de la Paix, 1899; pp. 75), sketches in a popular yet scholarly manner the origin of the Christian sites in and about the Roman Forum. Of all the chapters in the history of the city it is perhaps the one which is least familiar to the ordinary traveller, for it has left few visible traces behind it. As M. Duchesne shows, it was not till comparatively late (i. e. in the sixth century) that churches invaded the Forum, and we may add that many of them had disappeared long before our own time. Archaeological exploration has obliterated more of their vestiges, and now only four or five churches remain in even partial use. But in the early middle ages, when the Forum still retained its traditional importance as the centre of the city, the sanctuaries of the district played a considerable part in the religious life of Rome. All this is set forth by M. Duchesne with his usual convincing lucidity. One of the best sections is that on the Mamertine prison.

The Rev. A. C. Headlam has contributed to the series of essays on *Authority and Archaeology*, edited by Mr. Hogarth, a section on 'Christian Authority,' in which he gives a useful summary of the chief archaeological discoveries which affect our knowledge of early Christianity. As the book generally does not appear to deal with facts later than the third century, the period when the materials of Christian archaeology, especially in the department of inscriptions, become at all copious is necessarily excluded. However, if the remains of early Christianity are more scanty they are still the most important, and in some cases there is a probability that they will be increased by future discoveries. Mr. Headlam first deals with the literary evidence which has come to us from Egyptian papyri, two characteristic examples being the 'Sayings of Jesus' which bear on the criticism of the Gospels, and the 'libelli' of the Decian persecution which illustrate the history of the Church. He next brings together the various confirmations and illustrations of the New Testament history which have been provided by modern archaeological research, a department to which Prof. Ramsay has been so large a contributor. Inasmuch as the evidence of inscriptions generally as to the early Church has not yet been organized, this part of the subject is confined to two definite groups in which the results can be more easily estimated. These are the Phrygian inscriptions which have been collected in Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, and the evidence of the Roman Catacombs, both epigraphic and pictorial. As a rule nothing could be better than Mr. Headlam's critical treatment of the results. He sums them up thus. Archaeology 'is of great value to the historian,' but 'it is apt to be disappointing to the controversialist.' Its real importance is that 'it translates the history of early Christianity into life.'

G. M^cN. RUSHFORTH.

NEW TESTAMENT.

I. English Works.

(1) *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, edited by T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., and J. S. Black, M.A., L.L.D. Vol. I. London, A. & C. Black, 1899.

(2) *A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by J. H. Hastings, M.A., D.D. Vol. II. Edinburgh, T. T. Clark, 1899.

The concurrent publication of two Biblical dictionaries, both conceived on a large scale and employing a large number of contributors, may be thought to involve a regrettable dissipation of energy: and when it is remembered that in the unfinished second edition of Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* a third collection of valuable material is, if not buried, yet at least left in a position which entails its withdrawal from general use, it is impossible not to wish that this waste had been in some way prevented. It is at any rate a matter for satisfaction that in the sphere of Christian Biography and Antiquities our books of reference are limited to single undertakings which the industry of the next generation may be content merely to revise.

The term 'book of reference' contains the common answer to the question, 'What use should a dictionary attempt to serve?' One expects to find in it at least a fair account of received views, or views in which the majority of scholars would acquiesce: a series of reliable and not uncritical bibliographies, and as much really original work as is compatible with fairness to the general student, who will usually take his Dictionary as the printed equivalent of a sober-minded expert. With these requirements Mr. Hastings' *Dictionary* will be found generally to correspond. But the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* sets itself from the beginning a different task. 'The object of the editors has been . . . not only to bring the work up to the level of the best published writings, but, wherever possible, to carry the subjects a little beyond the point hitherto reached in print.' It would be as ungenerous to criticize this ideal unfavourably as it would be misleading to pass it by without notice. To make the newest points of view accessible is doubtless a service to scholarship; but scholarship arrested at a given moment and viewed at its points of furthest advance can never be fairly presented as typical. The editors of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* state their policy in a sentence which carries more than one meaning when they remind us of the 'precarious character of many of the details of the current biblical archaeology.'

What has here been said was suggested, it is fair to admit, neither by the preface nor by a careful study of the whole volume, but by the character of a certain number of the articles dealing with New Testament subjects. By far the larger part of the volume is of course devoted to the Old Testament: and in the New Testament articles we must acknowledge with gratitude the liberality which has permitted considerable divergence of views and has demanded no sacrifice of personal independence from the contributors. It is a gain also for English readers to have access to the work of the many Continental scholars who contribute (in English which is sometimes rather Continental) to the book: among whom Professors Jülicher, Bousset, and von Soden may be specially named. Prof. Jülicher sends an excellent piece of work on the Colossian and Ephesian Epistles: he maintains, though with caution, the Pauline authorship of the former, and leaves that of the latter open as a question not yet ripe for decision, while inclined to think this Epistle the work of a vindicator of St. Paul's catholicity (especially in Colossians) writing about 90 A. D. Prof. Bousset's article on the Apocalypse does good service in giving a careful account of the latest *Quellenkritik* of the book. The personality of the 'Apocalyptist' is however rather curiously treated. Prof. Bousset ventures to maintain (1) that only John the Elder was ever in Asia Minor; (2) that it is to him and not to the Apostle that early writers attribute the Fourth Gospel; (3) that he, though not the author either of the Gospel or the Apocalypse, exercised some influence over the composition of both. In support of (1) and (2) the letter of Polycrates to Victor (cf. Eus. *H. E.* v 24) is adduced. 'In a passage where everything turns upon the exact titles of the persons named, Polycrates designates as the στοιχεῖα of Asia Minor (1) Philip the apostle and his daughters; (2) John, who lay on the bosom of the Lord, μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος, who was buried in Ephesus; (3) Polycarp, &c. Polycrates thus designates, plainly with intention, the author of the Fourth Gospel as teacher and witness, not as apostle.' The straits to which such arbitrary devices reduce their inventors are well exemplified in the corollary, 'the statement . . . that the beloved disciple was "known unto the high priest" harmonizes well with the account of Polycrates, "who became priest"' (ὃς ἱερεὺς ἐγενήθη τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς). Prof. von Soden writes on the Chronology of the New Testament. This article—not on so elaborate a scale as that in Hastings' *Dictionary*—places the Nativity (only as a possible conjecture) in B.C. 4, the Crucifixion in A. D. 30 (assigning one year to the Ministry), and refuses to adopt any one system for the period 30–64, but gives four alternatives for events before St. Paul's second journey, and two for the period 45–64, the earlier alternatives corresponding (very roughly) with the dates of Harnack, the later with those of Lightfoot. The method produces an impression of candour rather than clearness. The subject is one for specialists, but the layman will probably find it curious to think that the story which makes John the Baptist six months older than our Lord was derived from the fact that he died six months before.

Mention must here be made of the articles contributed by Prof. P. W. Schmiedel of Zürich. These deal with important subjects, Acts of the Apostles, Apollos, Bar-Jesus, Barnabas, Christian (Name of), Community of Goods, &c., and it cannot be said that the dogmatism with which they state results at best not more than probable makes a favourable impression. Thus in the article 'Acts' it is laid down (1) that the writer of the We-sections cannot be the compiler of the whole book, (2) that the retention of the first person in the We-sections is not to be explained by lack of skill: while a whole series of inaccuracies, it is further said, results from the tendency of the author, his aim being to justify the Gentile Christianity of his time by an account of the origin of Christianity. Among these is to be reckoned the constant dependence of Paul's preaching to the Gentiles on his rejection by the Jews, which is 'quite irreconcilable' with Gal. i 6, ii 7 f., &c. It does need reconciliation, but it is no more 'irreconcilable' than are the parts of the narrative of the tumult in Thessalonica (ch. xvii 5–8), the 'sources' of which are analysed with unnecessary subtlety. A similar subtlety discloses the incompatibility of the Apollos of Acts with the Apollos of 1 Corinthians. The Apollos who taught the doctrine of Jesus (= τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) ἀκριβῶς cannot, it is said, have known only the baptism of John: ch. xviii 25 *a*, *b* must therefore be by a different hand from 25 *c*. Cannot then a statement and a qualification of it come from the same source? Again, that Apollos powerfully confuted the Jews of Achaia (ch. xviii 28) is 'not easily reconcilable' with 1 Cor. iii 6, 'I planted, Apollos watered,' taken with 1 Cor. xii 2, vii 18, which indicate that the Church of Corinth was composed mainly of Gentile Christians: xviii 28 is therefore treated as an interpolation by a later hand. A glance at ch. xviii 4 enables us to add this verse also to the work of the 'later hand.' St. Paul, it there appears, ἔπειθεν Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας: just the work of which one side is attributed to Apollos in xviii 28.

These quotations are made not in order to discredit Prof. Schmiedel's work (which indeed merits a careful and candid judgement), but to show that it is not always the kind of work for which a dictionary is the best place. It is not copious enough in its reference to other scholars, and hardly does them adequate justice. Prof. Ramsay, for instance, deserves better treatment: and that both in the article on Acts and in that on the Name of Christian, where Prof. Schmiedel is bold enough to think it demonstrable that the name Χριστιανός cannot have been as early as Acts xi 26 makes it.

Articles more likely to be of general use are that of Dr. Sanday on Corinthians; an admirable series by Dr. Armitage Robinson (Baptism, Bishop, Church, Deacon); the contributions to historical geography of Mr. W. J. Woodhouse; and the summary of Apocalyptic Literature by Mr. Charles, which cannot fail to be of the greatest service.

Turning to the second volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, we at once find how much Dr. Cheyne and his colleagues have gained in clearness by their ingenious system of typographical devices: in Hastings' Dictionary it is not nearly so easy to put one's finger on the main points. The general plan of this work is already well known. Perhaps its chief *differentia* is the inclusion (1) of numerous philological notes (by the editor) on the history of words used in the English versions, and (2) of articles dealing with Biblical Theology. Among these the treatment of the Doctrine of God in the Old and New Testaments by Dr. Davidson and Dr. Sanday stands out: though, as Dr. Sanday says, much would have been gained if the two articles could have been more closely related. Dr. Swete's article on Holy Spirit takes rank with these. Dr. Stewart of St. Andrews writes on Grace: Dr. Stevens of Yale on Holiness: Mr. Ottley on the Incarnation: and Dr. Orr on the Kingdom of God. On the literary side the volume contains articles on the Gospels by Prof. Stanton, and on the Epistle to the Hebrews by the late Prof. Bruce. One would have welcomed a treatment of the whole Johannine literature and its problems by a single hand: this, if it was ever contemplated, would have been frustrated by the lamented death of Prof. Reynolds, who writes alone on the Gospel. Dr. Salmond of Aberdeen deals with the Epistles, and Mr. Strong has an article on the Apostle John, which overlaps and supplements both.

Of other articles of first-class interest, those by Prof. Ramsay on Galatia and Galatians (i. e. the people; the Epistle is dealt with by Dr. Marcus Dods) add much to the value of the volume: but without question the most important contribution to it is Dr. Sanday's article on Jesus Christ. There is nothing in English so full (it takes up fifty pages in double column), so trustworthy, or so modern, and it makes the volume which contains it indispensable to students.

(3) The leisure hours of a scholar can rarely have been turned to better account than those of the late Dr. Frederick Field. Dr. Field left Cambridge in 1839, at the age of thirty-eight, having only published at that time an edition of Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew. An edition and a translation of the same Father's Homilies on St. Paul's Epistles, together with a revision of Grabe's text of the Septuagint, were the only tangible results of some thirty years' seclusion in country parishes; but the depth and solidity of the learning accumulated during that period have their proof and monument in Dr. Field's great edition of the Hexapla of Origen, which was published in 1874. Eleven years before this the first part of *Otium Norvicense* had appeared: it was

a *prolusio* to the Hexapla in the shape of a partial reconstruction of the Greek text of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. *Otium Norvicense* (*Pars Altera*), printed in 1876, is a brief series of notes, corrections, and additions to Dr. Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus.*

The third part, which first appeared in 1881, has now been reprinted with additional notes left in MS by the author. Dr. Field's knowledge of the LXX and New Testament—in itself almost unique—gained enormously from its alliance with his indefatigable study of other Greek literature, both secular and patristic. The astonishing list of authors whom he read from end to end between his seventy-fifth and seventy-ninth years (the first three of the ten are Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Stobaeus) is an index both of astonishing physical vigour and also of the conviction with which he held that Biblical Greek can only be known thoroughly if it is known in connexion with the later Greek literature at large. A little fraction of the erudition so acquired is preserved to us in the volume now issued. These *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press) were suggested by the 'innovations' of the Revised Version of 1881. Many of them are criticisms upon that 'faithfulness to the grammatical and etymological proprieties' of the original which, as Dr. Field wrote (Preface, p. xiv), has had the effect of throwing 'over the general style an air of pedantry and punctiliousness which cannot but be distasteful to the reader who has been "nourished up" in the plain homely and idiomatic English of the men of 1611.' They are not, however, notes on English style, but attempts to prove from philological considerations the propriety of discarded renderings (or in a few cases to justify the R.V.). E. g. on Mc. xiv 2 (μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ, A.V. 'lest there be,' R.V. 'lest haply there shall be' [cf. Col. ii 8, Heb. iii 12]), it is pointed out that the effort of R.V. to make a subtle distinction between this passage and St. Matthew's ἵνα μὴ . . . γένηται is both ungrammatical and unnecessary. In 1 Cor. i 10 (κατηρτισμένοι, A.V. 'perfectly joined together,' R.V. 'perfected together') the old version is justified from such parallels as Stob. *Flor.* i 85 φίλους διαφερομένους καταρτίζοιμι.

A second large class of notes (the most important and interesting) deals with questions of Textual Criticism from the standpoint of internal evidence: a business which always requires the strongest and most delicate scholarship. Here Dr. Field not infrequently comes into conflict with the Revisers, as was natural for a scholar who was criticizing the work of men to whom the authority of MSS quite rightly appeared to be generally stronger than that of any subjective criteria. There are many readings in R.V. which we accept as it were for conscience sake, without really believing them original. Of these the reading in Acts xx 24, combated in long notes by Dr. Field (pp. 132 and 252), is an example: ἀλλ᾽ οὐδενὸς λόγου ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ (ℵ* BC) is really impossible. Dr. Field's conjecture, λόγον ποιοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἡγοῦμαι, based on T.R. λόγον ποιοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἔχω, has the merits of accounting (in part) for the T.R. and of resting on a possible *homoeoteleuton*; but the reading of ℵcAD*, which is followed by Blass, though not convincing, is at any rate simpler—λόγον ἔχω οὐδὲ ποιοῦμαι. Again, does any one believe in ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι (Acts xxvi 28)? It is rightly contended (p. 142) that this is not the Greek for 'with but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' But it is very difficult to say what the original reading may have been, though πείθῃ, the reading of A, makes excellent sense as far as it goes. In any case it is hard to believe in Dr. Hort's suggestion of πέποιθας as the original of με πειθεις: and the γενέσθαι of T.R. is too *proclivis*, and will not account for ποιῆσαι, while it may itself be due to the γενέσθαι of the succeeding clause, that is, to the effort of a 'subjective' scribe to make Agrippa's words tally with St. Paul's answer: a problem for which the R.V. has not provided any better solution than that of T.R. Attention may be called here to the note advocating the admirable conjecture of Camerarius (adopted by Cobet) of ὑσσῷ for ὑσσώπῳ in St. John xix 29. The κάλαμος of the other Evangelists can have had nothing to do with hyssop; on the other hand ὑσσός would just fit in with κάλαμος, for ὑσσός was the Greek equivalent of the Roman *pilum*; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant.* v 46 ὑσσοὶ . . . ξύλα προμήκη καὶ χειροπληθῆ τριῶν οὐχ ἧττον ποδῶν σιδηροῦς ὀβελίσκους ἔχοντα προύχοντας. Among other points which will interest textual critics we may mention the ingenious explanation of δευτεροπρώτῳ, Lc. vi 1; the rejection of MS evidence in Lc. xxi 35 and 1 Cor. xi 24 (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ⟨κλώμενον⟩); the defence of T.R. in Jo. xiii 24 against the weaker sense given by BCLX vg &c.

A large number of Dr. Field's notes fall outside the two classes named above and are purely exegetical. Of interesting renderings justified by sound analogies we may notice Mt. xiii 12 περισσευθήσεται (impersonally and parallel to δοθήσεται) = 'shall be abundantly given'; Mc. xiv 72 ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε = 'he covered his head and wept'; Lc. x 30 περιπεσεῖν = 'to meet with'; xiii 9 εἰς τὸ μέλλον = 'next year'; xxii 44 ἀγωνία = 'overwhelming fear'; Jo. viii 37 χωρεῖν = 'to find room'; Heb. viii 1 κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις means 'To *crown* our present argument,' which gives a quite permissible meaning to κεφάλαιον (cf. Dr. Field's parallels, which could easily be strengthened) and seems to improve the balance of the argument, laying the stress as it does on ἔχομεν as contrasted e.g. with ἔπρεπεν, vii 26.

Many of Dr. Field's conclusions are, of course, open to criticism, indeed they challenge it; and not the smallest service done by the republication and enlargement of his original *fasciculus* will be the encouragement it should give to the discussion of exegetical questions from the philological point of view. We have to thank Mr. Knight (who has edited and selected the new matter) and the Cambridge University Press for a fascinating book.

(4) Messrs. T. & T. Clark have issued a translation of Prof. Godet's *Introduction to the New Testament: Gospel Collection and St. Matthew*, which is the second part of a general introduction to the New Testament. The first volume (on the Pauline Epistles) has already been translated. This present instalment consists of two chapters: (i) On the Collection of the Four Gospels, (ii) On the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The general purport of ch. i is to trace the formation of the *ἁγία τετρακτύς* back to St. John: ch. ii is general and discursive. The argument in ch. i at least would need much 'castigation,' especially in detail, before it could be allowed to stand; and, in particular, readers should be chary of accepting Prof. Godet's translations of his sources—of Papias, for instance, and the Muratorian fragment. The translator might have 'anglicized' a little more: we do not speak of Valentine, Naplous, Pythagorism, Apraates, or Thraséas: the 'range of Papias,' 'on the faith of Eusebius,' are odd expressions.

(5) In the Rev. H. G. Miller's Commentary on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (Skeffingtons) the homiletic interest is paramount. Thus ii 10 *αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα*, rendered 'for we are his poem,' elicits a long development of the idea which the rendering represents: the 'psalms and hymns' of v 19 are the occasion for an exposition of the spiritual value of music. All the points made are copiously illustrated from general literature. Thus, though not a book for the scholar, this commentary may be found interesting and suggestive for expository purposes.

(6) To the Cambridge Greek Testament series, now nearly complete, has been added an edition of the *Pastoral Epistles* by Dr. J. H. Bernard of Dublin. This commentary will be of great service to students, who have long needed something more modern than that of Dr. Ellicott, though it will not enable them to dispense with the German editions mentioned by Dr. Bernard, among which Prof. von Soden's *Hand-commentar* deserves special recommendation. In the introduction the Pauline authorship is maintained as the most probable among many difficult hypotheses, and Dr. Bernard contends boldly for an original distinction between *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*. The argument deserves careful examination. We could wish that the whole series came up to the high level maintained by its latest member.

(7) Mr. H. H. B. Ayles' *Destination, Date, and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge University Press) shows considerable

acquaintance with German work on this subject, as also with patristic authorities. Materials so copious and complex require rather more clearness of arrangement and style than the book displays: it is not easy to read. The conclusions reached are that the Epistle was written to the Church of Jerusalem between 64 and 66 by Barnabas, to whom Mr. Ayles contends that the original tradition of the Roman Church assigned its authorship. One is still inclined to say with St. Jerome, in a passage quoted by Mr. Ayles (and curiously interpreted, p. 112), 'nihil interesse cuius sit cum ecclesiastici viri sit.'

(8) There can be no doubt of the demand for plain expositions of the Bible. The deserved success of such books as those of Canon Gore on the Sermon on the Mount and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Romans, or Mr. Moulton on the 'Literary Study of the Bible,' has proved that the public has come to believe that Scripture can and should be made intelligible. What the educated understand by 'theology' is, however, not always of such vital importance; we welcome therefore everything which by setting people to work on things of permanent value tends to divert them from facile and fruitless discussion of polemical topics. Dr. Lock's *St. Paul the Master Builder*, a reprint of four lectures given at St. Asaph in 1897, will do good service: its expositions of the practical statesmanship and the ethical teaching of St. Paul are excellent: they may be especially recommended as a supplement to those of Canon Gore mentioned above.

(9) Messrs. Williams & Norgate have issued a second edition of Dr. Colin Campbell's synopsis of the *First Three Gospels in Greek*. This work differs in plan from similar efforts, such as those of Tischendorf or Rushbrooke: from Tischendorf in leaving the Fourth Gospel on one side, and from both in presenting the three texts with no change of order. Where obvious dislocations have taken place, one of the parallels is either merely indicated by a reference, or printed in full within brackets. This arrangement, though it involves printing many passages twice, has the advantage of enabling the reader to follow each Gospel continuously if he wishes. Dr. Campbell intimates that this volume is only a first instalment, and that the relation of St. Mark to the other Synoptists will be discussed in a sequel. He indicates, however (if we construe rightly an involved sentence in the Preface), that he will support and even outdo St. Augustine; St. Mark is to be shown to have used not only St. Matthew but St. Luke as well. We shall await the defence of this thesis with interest. Should the present volume ever be reissued, the rather numerous misprints of this edition might well be corrected.

H. N. BATE.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

Church Quarterly Review, October 1899 (No. 97, Vol. xlix: Spottiswoode & Co.). Rivington on the Roman 'Primacy,' A. D. 430–451—The Philosopher as Patriot—Dr. Briggs' Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture—West African Problems—The Dean of Christ Church on Hooker and the Puritans—Professor Earle on Dante's Earthly Paradise—Mrs. Oliphant's Life and Letters—The Letters of R. Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Barrett—'Authority and Archaeology'—Dean Liddell—Galton's Message and Position of the Church of England—The Decision on Incense and the 'Hearing' on Reservation.

Jewish Quarterly Review, October 1899 (Vol. xii, No. 45: Macmillan & Co.). G. MARGOLIOUTH The original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus xxxi 12–31 and xxxvi 22–xxxvii 26—S. A. HIRSCH Early English Hebraists: Roger Bacon and his Predecessors—Poetry: On the Ocean, translated by A. LUCAS—W. BACHER An Hypothesis about the Hebrew Fragments of Sirach—A. COWLEY Notes on the Cambridge Texts of Ben Sira—S. SCHECHTER Genizah Specimens—M. STEINSCHNEIDER An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews: I (*continued*)—Notes: Miscellanea; T. K. CHEYNE, D. SIMONSEN, H. HIRSCHFELD, E. N. ADLER—Critical Notices.

Expositor, October 1899 (Fifth Series, No. 58: Hodder & Stoughton). A. MENZIES The Lord's Supper: St. Mark or St. Paul?—V. BARTLET Some Points in Pauline History and Chronology—J. WATSON The Doctrines of Grace: (8) Sanctification—J. MONRO GIBSON Apocalyptic Sketches: (9) The Marriage Supper of the Lamb—(The late) H. DRUMMOND Spiritual Diagnosis: an Argument for Placing the Study of the Soul on a Scientific Basis—F. W. LEWIS Note on the Date of the First Epistle of Peter.

November 1899 (No. 59). A. CARR Love and Righteousness: A Study on the Influence of Christianity on Language—J. H. BERNARD The Evidential Value of Miracle—R. A. FALCONER The Future of the Kingdom—B. W. BACON A Criticism of the New Chronology of Paul—

A. E. Burn The Ambrosiaster and Isaac the Converted Jew—J. Monro Gibson Apocalyptic Sketches: (10) The Great White Throne—R. B. Girdlestone To what Tribe did Samuel belong?—C. H. W. Johns Did the Assyrians Coin Money?

December 1899 (No. 60). W. Lock The Sheep and the Goats —B. W. Bacon A Criticism of the New Chronology of Paul—W. M. Ramsay Mr. Lewin and Professor Bacon on the Passover—J. Laidlaw Richard Rothe, of Heidelberg—J. Monro Gibson Apocalyptic Sketches: (11) The City of God; (12) The Paradise of God.

(2) American.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, October 1899 (Vol. x, No. 40: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). J. M. King The Fatherhood of God according to Christ—R. McC. Edgar The Ordination of Messiah—J. H. Edwards The Vanishing Sense of Sin—J. Lindsay Mysticism, True and False—E. N. White 'The Catholic Apostolic Church'—N. J. M. Bogert The Popular Demand for Young Ministers—Ecclesiastical Notes—H. C. Minton Dr. Kuyper's Theological Encyclopaedia—G. Vos Dr. Bavinck's Dogmatics—B. B. Warfield Late Discussions of Kenosis —Recent Theological Literature.

(3) French.

Revue Biblique, October 1899 (Vol. viii, No. 4: Paris, V. Lecoffre; for the school of the Dominican convent of St. Stephen of Jerusalem). R. P. Condamin Études sur l'Ecclésiaste—E. Cosquin Encore l' 'Histoire du sage Ahikar:' vraies et fausses infiltrations d' 'Ahikar' dans la Bible—R. P. Lagrange Deux chants de guerre: le cantique de Moïse après le passage de la Mer Rouge et la chanson d'Hésébon—Rouvier Gébal-Biblos: La Nécropole phénicienne—Mélanges: Mgr. Batiffol De quelques homélies de saint Jean Chrysostome et de la version gothique des Ecritures—R. P. Parisot Signification musicale de Sélah-Diapsalma—R. P. Vincent La Tour Méa—R. P. Lagrange La Dormition de la Sainte Vierge et la Maison de Jean Marc—Chronique: Dussaud et Macler Exploration du Hauran oriental—R. P. Vincent Les fouilles anglaises—Recensions—Bulletin.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 3: Paris, A. Picard). R. P. Petit Réglements généraux des Arméniens catholiques—F. Nau Opuscules Maronites (*suite*)—Dom Parisot La bénédiction liturgique des raisins—E. Blochet Neuf chapitres du 'Songe du viel pelerin' de Philippe de Mézières, relatifs à l'Orient—J.-B. Chabot La vie du moine Rabban Youssef Bousnaya (*suite*)—R. P. V. Ermoni L'Ordinal copte (*suite*)—J. Babakhan Protestantisme et Catholicisme chez le peuple nestorien: une revue néo-syriaque à Ourmiah—J.-B. Chabot Les évêques jacobites du viii^e au xiii^e siècle d'après la Chronique de Michel le syrien—Mélanges: DOM RENAUDIN Le culte de S. Julien du Mans dans l'église russe—Bibliographie.

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses, September-October 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 5: Paris, 74 Boulevard Saint-Germain). P. CHAVANNE Le Patriotisme de Prudence: (2) Sentiments de Prudence à l'égard des institutions et des traditions romaines—J. TURMEL L'Angélologie depuis le faux Denys l'Aréopagite: (3) Date de la création des anges, leur distinction spécifique, leurs perfections—H. MARGIVAL Richard Simon et la critique biblique au xvii^e siècle: (12) Les derniers travaux de R. Simon et la Défense de la Tradition et des saints Pères—A. LOISY Notes sur la Genèse: (6) Le sacrifice d'Isaac (Gen. xxii 1–19)—Chronique biblique: J. SIMON (1) Histoire de la littérature biblique; (2) Langue hébraïque, éditions, traductions et critique textuelle; (3) Exégèse de l'Ancien Testament.

November-December 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 6). A. LOISY Nicodème (Jean iii 1–21)—H. MARGIVAL Richard Simon et la critique biblique au xvii^e siècle: (13) L'influence de Richard Simon—J. TURMEL L'Angélologie depuis le faux Denys l'Aréopagite: (4) Le lieu et le supplice des démons, le nombre des anges, les anges gardiens—Chronique biblique: J. SIMON (3) Exégèse de l'Ancien Testament (*suite*).

(4) GERMAN.

Theologische Quartalschrift, 1899 (Vol. lxxxi, No. 4: Ravensburg, H. Kitz). SCHANZ Zum Studium der Theologie in Amerika—VETTER Die Zeugnisse der vorex. Propheten über d. Pentateuch: (1) Amos—MAUSBACH Die Stellung des hl. Thomas v. A. zu Maimonides i. d. Lehre v. d. Prophetie—ROHLING Die Ueberlebenden 1 Kor. xv 51—Reviews—Analecta.

Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, October 1899 (Vol. xlii, No. 4: Leipzig, O. Reisland). A. HILGENFELD Marcosia novissima—A. AMELUNGK Untersuchung über Pseudo-Ignatius—H. GUNKEL Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen—J. DRAESEKE Zum Philosophen Joseph—E. NESTLE Zum Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus—A. HILGENFELD Das Johannes-Bild des Lykomedes—Notices.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, September 1899 (Vol. ix, No. 5: Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr). TRAUB Zur Kritik der materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung—A. BURCKHARDT Aus der modernen systematischen Theologie Grossbritanniens: die anglikanische Kirche.

November 1899 (Vol. ix, No. 6). A. BURCKHARDT Aus der modernen systematischen Theologie Grossbritanniens (*Schluss*): Schottland und die Dissenters—A. Hering Die Idee Jesu vom Reiche Gottes und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1900, part 1 (Gotha: A. Perthes). I. Articles: Blass Zu den zwei Texten der Apostelgeschichte—Treplin Die Essenerquellen gewürdigt in einer Untersuchung der in neuerer Zeit an ihnen geübten Kritik—Baerwinkel Johann Matthäus Meyfart. II. Notes: Boehmer מלך und נשיא bei Ezechiel—Ley Zur Erklärung von Hiob xix 26—Schulze Die Unterlagen für die Abschiedsrede zu Milet in Apostelgeschichte xx 18–31—Weiss Der Eingang des ersten Korintherbriefes. III. Reviews: Haupt Zahn, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. IV. Miscellanea: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche bis auf Luthers Enchiridion.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, September 1899 (Vol. x, No. 9: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). Wiesinger Die Predigt des Apostels Paulus als Vorbild aller Predigt nach 1 Kor. ii—E. Koenig Zwei Grundthatsachen in der Geschichte des Jahvehglaubens—Boehmer Habakuks Schrift im Feuer der neueren Kritik—Lundgreen Die Einführung des Christentums in Äthiopien.

October 1899 (Vol. x, No. 10). P. Feine Der Ursprung der Sünde nach Paulus—H. Guersching Das geistliche Amt und die sozialen Probleme der Gegenwart—O. Undritz 'Ist es als feststehend zu betrachten dass die Tage im Schöpfungsbericht als Zeitperioden aufzufassen seien und ist darauf in der Konfirmandenlehre einzugehen?'

November 1899 (Vol. x, No. 11). H. Guersching Das geistliche Amt und die sozialen Probleme der Gegenwart (*Schluss*)—Noth Schleiermacher's Reden über die Religion—Haering Vom 'Glauben an den heiligen Geist.'

December 1899 (Vol. x, No. 12). W. Schmidt Zur Echtheitsfrage des Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum—K. Kroeber Die Schliessung eines rechtlichen Verbandes der deutschen evangelischen Landeskirchen—Kahl Die bayerische Landeskirche im neunzehnten Jahrhundert.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

APRIL, 1900

'OUR ALMS AND OBLATIONS': AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

THE object of the following paper is to investigate, solely on historical grounds, the sense of the word 'oblations,' as it occurs in the prayer 'For the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth' in the Book of Common Prayer &c. of the Church of England. It is now several years since the subject was discussed at considerable length by the late Dr. Howson (Dean of Chester) and the learned liturgist, the late Canon T. F. Simmons[1]. The discussion was not exhaustive. A good deal of additional evidence deserves consideration, and the evidence formerly adduced claims a fresh review.

I. As is well known, the word 'oblations' appears for the first time in the prayer 'For the whole state of Christ's Church' in the Prayer Book of 1662. Now in the same Prayer Book we find a new rubrical direction (placed immediately before this prayer and after the rubric directing the reception and presentation of money-offerings from the people), ordering that 'when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.' Hence some have concluded (and not unnaturally at first sight) that in the phrase 'alms and oblations,' occurring in the prayer immediately following, we have a reference to the two several things placed consecutively upon the table,—in 'alms' to the collected money of the congregation, in 'oblations' to the elements. It is also to be observed that the collected money is first placed on the table, and then the bread and wine; and in the subsequent prayer the order of the words is 'alms' first, and then 'oblations.' This interpretation has the charm of simplicity, and is undoubtedly attractive. The student of Christian antiquity is pleased to see here what he thinks a revival of the rite of offering the bread and wine in a manner that reminds him of the practice of the Church in days as early as those of Justin Martyr.

---

[1] In the pages of the *Churchman* (January and June, 1882).

Yet a further examination of the evidence will lead the inquirer to hesitate in accepting this interpretation. And, first, it will be observed that the prayer for the Church militant is ordered to be said whether there is a Communion or not. If no bread and wine have been placed upon the table, the minister is still enjoined to ask God mercifully to accept 'our alms and oblations.' This fact alone seems sufficient to dispose of the view of those who take the word 'oblations' to refer *exclusively* to the bread and wine. Hence, although this view was put forward not many years after the publication of the Prayer Book of 1662 by Symon Patrick (afterwards Bishop of Chichester, and then of Ely), it must be dismissed as inconsistent with the text of the Prayer Book itself[1].

Secondly, the study of the writings of the English divines of the seventeenth century shows very plainly that there was a school of churchmen whose study of the Fathers and of the ancient Liturgies made them well acquainted with the beautiful and edifying rite of offering God's creatures of bread and wine at the altar prior to consecration. There can be little doubt that there were some in 1661 who would gladly have seen the rite introduced into the English Prayer Book, as, in 1637, it had been introduced, with the approval of Laud and Wren, into the Scottish Prayer Book[1]. We find evidence of a disposition among the divines of the seventeenth century to regard the elements of bread and wine as 'oblations' as early, at least, as Dean Field, who wrote, 'We must observe that by the name sacrifice, gift, or present, first, the *oblation* of the people is meant that consisteth of bread and wine, brought and set upon the Lord's Table[2].' Again, Joseph Mede, though from a somewhat different standpoint, laid great stress on the *oblation* of the bread and wine[3]. The learned layman, Hamon L'Estrange, writing shortly before the last revision[4], reckons as the first of 'the sacrifices and oblations' of the Holy Communion 'the bringing of our gifts to the altar, that is the species and elements of the sacred symbols[5].' Herbert Thorndike was not only a 'coadjutor' on the episcopal side at the Savoy Conference, but was a member of the Convocation of Canterbury (1661) which adopted our present Prayer Book; and his signature, as Proctor of the clergy of the Diocese of London, is subscribed to 'the Book annexed.' Two years previously he had written, 'The elements of the Eucharist before they be consecrated are truly accounted *oblations* or sacrifices[6].' These passages (and others could be added) are sufficient to show that there were churchmen in the seventeenth century who were not unlikely to be willing to see a ceremonial offering of the bread and wine introduced into the English Prayer Book.

---

[1] 'We pray him therefore, in our communion service, to accept our "oblations" (meaning those of bread and wine) as well as our "alms."' *Mensa Mystica* (*Works*, Oxford, 1858, vol. i p. 115). The editor of the Oxford edition of Patrick's *Works* does not inform us from what edition of the *Mensa Mystica* he has printed his text. These words did not, of course, appear in the first edition (1660), but they are to be found in the second (1667) and subsequent editions. If the conclusions of this paper be accepted, Patrick's observation is an illustration of the caution with which even almost contemporary glosses are to be viewed. For further observations on Patrick's view, see p. 344.

But, more than this, we have evidence that a proposal with this intent was actually brought before the revisers of 1661, and brought before them by no mean authority. Indeed, no one exercised a more powerful influence upon the work of the last revision than John Cosin. We can say with considerable confidence that Cosin's corrections and emendations of the

---

[1] The rubric of the Scottish Prayer Book runs thus: 'And the Presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that service.'

[2] *Of the Church* (edit. 1628) p. 204.

[3] See more particularly *The Christian Sacrifice*, chap. viii (1635).

[4] L'Estrange died in 1656. The *Alliance* was not published till 1659.

[5] *Alliance of Divine Offices* p. 273 (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).

[6] *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* (printed in the Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.; *Works* vol. iv part i p. 107).

Prayer Book, as exhibited in Sancroft's 'fair copy' (now in the Bodleian), was a volume actually before the committee engaged on the review of the Prayer Book at Ely House in 1661[1]. Now in this book we find the suggested rubric, 'And, if there be a Communion, the priest shall then offer up and place upon the Table soe much Bread and Wine as he shall thinke sufficient.' Here was a suggested rubric that came before the committee with all the weight of Cosin's well-deserved reputation; but the committee, while adopting the substance of the rubric, deliberately struck out the words '*offer up*.' It is difficult to conceive a more emphatic expression of dissent from the view that the placing of the bread and wine upon the table was to be put forward, in the Prayer Book of 1662, as an offering or oblation. And it should be observed that it is not as though the omission was *per incuriam*; the suggestion was made, and it was deliberately rejected.

Thirdly, the influence of the ill-fated Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 upon the last revision of the English Prayer Book could easily be illustrated by scores of examples. In that book in the corresponding rubric we read 'the presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine' &c. But in the case of this particular rubric its influence was insufficient to effect the adoption of the rubric in its entirety in the Prayer Book of 1662: 'offer up' was not adopted.

Fourthly, of signal import, as bearing upon our inquiry, is the striking difference and contrast between the language of the present rubric with reference to the presentation of the 'alms and other devotions' of the people, and its language with reference to the placing of the elements. We exhibit the two in juxtaposition, italicizing the words that bring out the contrast.

'The Deacons, Church-wardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, . . . and *reverently bring it* [the decent bason] to the Priest, who shall *humbly present and place it* upon the holy Table.'

'And when there is a Communion the Priest shall then *place* upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.'

---

[1] For an account of Sancroft's 'fair copy,' see Parker's *Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer* p. xcvi.

The alms &c. are to be *reverently* brought, and *humbly presented and placed*: while not a word is said of the presentation of the elements. They are to be 'placed,' and the rubric does not qualify the mode of their being placed. This contrast in rubrics immediately consecutive, and more particularly in view of the fact that the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 and Cosin's notes were before the revisers, seems to point to the superior influence, with regard to this question, of those among the revisers who may be called the more conservative, or cautious, or timid party. If there had been a suspicion about such words as 'offer up,' the word 'present,' one would fancy, might have been used with little danger of giving offence; yet even the word 'present' is avoided. It is impossible to ignore the significance of the contrast.

It may be here remarked that, while the first of the four considerations that have been laid before the reader is simply destructive of the theory that the word 'oblations' refers *exclusively* to the elements, the other three raise and support the presumption that since the word 'offer' and even the word 'present' have been studiously avoided, we are not warranted in supposing that the elements together with the 'other devotions' of the people were by the revisers intended to be included under the word 'oblations' occurring in the prayer following.

II. But it will be reasonably asked—If the word 'oblations' does not refer to the elements, to what does it refer? And why was it introduced for the first time at the last revision? Both these questions can, it seems to me, be satisfactorily answered.

It will be best, in the first place, to illustrate the use of the word 'oblations' as applied to offerings in money. The rubric of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 has been often pointed to in this connexion, but it is so pertinent that it may once again be transcribed. It runs as follows:—'While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the offertory, the Deacon, or (if no such be present) one of the Church-wardens shall receive the *devotions* of the people there present in a bason provided for that purpose. And when all have *offered*, hee shall reverently bring the said bason with the *oblations* therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the holy Table[1].' Now in the same book, at the end of the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, we find a rubric directing that 'that *which was offered* shall be divided in the presence of the Presbyter and the Church-wardens, whereof one half shall be to the use of the Presbyter to provide him books of holy divinity: the other half shall be faithfully kept and employed on some pious or charitable use, for the decent furnishings of that Church, or the publike relief of their poore, at the discretion of the Presbyter and Church-wardens.' We see from this that half of the *oblations* which had been brought in the bason were always to go to increasing the clergyman's library, and that of the other half the whole, or part of it, might be spent upon such pious uses as the furnishing of the church. It was natural when the relief of the poor was only a possible destination of the money offerings to choose the more comprehensive word. Yet in the Scottish Prayer Book the adjustment of expression was halting, for in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church' we have no words referring to 'oblations' as distinct from 'alms.' This blot, as we shall see, was observed by Cosin, and a correction suggested.

At this point it may be well to exhibit some evidence illustrative of the use of the word 'oblations' with particular reference to moneys given towards the maintenance of the clergy. If the liturgical student is familiar with the application of the word 'oblation' to the offering of the elements in the service of the Eucharist, those who extend their inquiries into the wider field of Church law and custom are familiar with another technical or quasi-technical use of the term.

And, first, it may be well to glance at the use of the word in the mediaeval period. We have ample evidence of the use of *oblationes* in the sense of money-offerings towards the maintenance of the clergy, and more particularly to the money-offerings made at mass. Thus in the Statutes of the Church of Lichfield, enacted in 1194, we read, 'Dignitas autem ecclesiae Lichefeldensis est, ut quicunque capellanus, notus vel ignotus, in aliquo altari, principali tamen excepto, celebraverit, *oblationes omnes argenti*, quae sibi offeruntur, ad usus suos libere poterit retinere, nisi pro aliquo quinque presbyterorum celebrare sit requisitus[1].'

---

[1] The italics are mine.

In the Statutes of the Synod of Exeter (1287) it is provided that the erection of chapels should not be prejudicial to the interests of the mother parochial church, and therefore it was enacted 'ut sacerdotes in dictis capellis ministrantes *universas oblationes*, quas in ipsis (*al.* ipsos) offerri contigerit, ecclesiae matricis rectori cum integritate restituant[2].' Gilbert, bishop of Chichester, in Synod, in 1292, condemned certain accursed persons who, at weddings, churchings, and other rites, 'ad unius *oblationem* denarii *devotionem populi* restringere sunt moliti; residuum *oblationis* fidelium suis pro libito vel alienis usibus applicantes[3].' In Lynwood's *Provinciale*, after learning the general sense of the word, we read, 'Specialiter vero loquendo dicitur *Oblatio* id quod *in Missa* offertur sacerdoti, quae in praecipuis festivitatibus debita et necessaria est[4].' What was originally voluntary, and in theory was for a long time voluntary, came to be regarded as 'dues.' The offering-days, generally four in number, are often mentioned, but they were not, with the exception of Christmas and Easter, everywhere the same. In the Constitutions (1256) of Giles de Bridport, bishop of Salisbury, all parishioners are enjoined to *offer* four times a year, 'scilicet in die natalis Domini, in die Paschae, in die solennitatis ecclesiae, et in dedicatione ecclesiae[5].' In the Constitutions of the Synod of Exeter in 1287 (referred to above) there is a whole chapter *De Oblationibus*, in which it was ordained that every adult, viz. every one of fourteen years and upwards, should bring his *oblations* to the parish church four times a year, namely at Christmas, Easter, the feast 'sancti loci,' and the feast of the dedication of the church or (if such were the custom of the place) the feast of All Saints[6]. Coming down to the period of the

---

[1] Wilkins' *Concilia* i 499. The five presbyters here referred to I take to be the five chaplains appointed specially to the duties of the great altar. Without the permission of that one of the five who happened to be at the time 'hebdomadary,' no one with the exception of the bishop and the dean was permitted to celebrate at the great altar. Ibid. 500.

[2] Ibid. ii 137.

[3] Ibid. ii 183.

[4] Lib. i tit. 3 p. 21 (edit. 1679).

[5] Wilkins' *Concilia* i 713.

[6] Ibid. ii 160, where other interesting regulations concerning 'oblations' will be found.

Reformation we find the Act 27 Hen. VIII c. 12 (1536) ordaining 'that the Feasts of the Nativity of our Lord, of Easter Day, of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, and St. Michael the Archangel be accounted, accepted, and taken for the four general Offering-Days.' The bearing of the Offering-Days (which were continued in the Reformed Church, and were referred to in the rubric up to the last revision of the Prayer Book) on the choice of the offertory sentences will be seen later on.

It was, of course, quite common to make an offering for the use of the priest on other days beside the days known more particularly as 'offering-days.' And in the accounts kept of the expenses of noble and royal personages in the mediaeval period the frequency of such oblations is very observable. In vernacular books of devotion for the laity references to the general practice are common[1].

As to the exact time at mass and the manner in which the offerings of the laity were made, the rubrics of the English missals are, so far as I know, silent. But the popular books, which we may call 'Companions to the Mass,' show that the people made their oblations immediately after the Mass-Creed and Offertory had been sung. At this point those who wished to offer went up towards the altar[2]. Though this was probably the general mode of the laity making their offerings, it is likely enough that there were local variations, as there were certainly abuses that had to be corrected, such, for instance, as that condemned in a thirteenth-century Scottish Statute, from which it appears that at the communion of the laity on Easter Day certain priests would hold the host in their hands and not deliver it till the lay communicant had actually handed over his oblation[3].

---

[1] Much information on the subject will be found in Canon Simmons' notes to the *Lay Folks Mass-Book* (E. E. T. S.) pp. 222–244.

[2] Canon Simmons (*Lay Folks Mass-Book* p. 236) gives evidence in support of the following statement: 'Up to the Reformation the offerers used to come up to the altar, upon the celebrant giving them a signal by turning round; perhaps, if they were slow in coming, by asking for his offering; or by coming down the altar steps, attended, if it were high mass, by deacon and sub-deacon; or, in a small church, by the parish clerk. The offerings were placed in the hand of the celebrant, or in the paten held by the deacon, or in a bason held by the clerk or by laymen of estate' &c.

[3] *Statuta Ecclesiae Scoticanae* vol. ii p. 40 'Audivimus a quibusdam cum in die

For the purpose of this paper this hasty glance at mediaeval usage will suffice; and we come down to what for our object is of more importance, the use of the word 'oblation' in the reformed Church of England. There is a pertinent passage in Hooker, which though familiar deserves citation, because it is not only itself an historical testimony, but from the weight and authority of the writer it would naturally have influenced the thoughts and the language of the divines of the seventeenth century. T[homas] C[artwright] had objected to the word 'offerings' being applied to the money given to the clergyman by women at their churching. Hooker thus replied—'The name of Oblations applied not only here to those small and petit payments which yet are a part of the minister's right, but also generally given unto all such allowances as serve for their needful maintenance, is both ancient and convenient. For as the life of the clergy is spent in the service of God, so it is sustained with his revenue. Nothing therefore more proper than to give the name of Oblations to such payments in token that we offer unto him whatsoever his ministers receive[1].'

I next present an example of the use of the word 'oblation' of an earlier date, and this time in association with the word 'alms.' It will be seen too that it is used in a wider sense than that of offerings for the clergy, and its application extends generally to gifts for 'pious uses.' The passage is from the royal 'Injunctions' of 1547[2]. 'They shall provide and have within three months after this visitation a strong chest, with a hole in the upper part thereof . . . which chest you shall set and fasten near unto the high altar, to the intent the parishioners should put into it their *oblation and alms* for their poor neighbours . . . the which *alms and devotion* of the people the keepers of the keys shall at times convenient take out of the chest, and distribute the same in the presence of the whole parish, or six of them, to be

---

Pasche fideles Christi suscipere debent Eucharistie sacramentum, quidam presbyteri (quod dolentes referimus) illud prestare denegant impudenter nisi prius *oblationes* suas tunc porrigant ad altare, et eodem die exactiones faciunt a laicis, corpus Christi tenentes in manibus ac si dicerent *Quid mihi vultis dare, et ego eum tradam.*' At Salisbury we find an ordinance against receiving after mass oblations from the laity who have communicated on Easter-Day. See Frere's *Sarum Customs* p. 162.

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity* V lxxiv 4 (Keble's edit.).

[2] Wilkins' *Concilia* iv 3. The *Injunctions* will also be found in Cranmer's *Miscellaneous Writings* (Parker Society) p. 503.

truly and faithfully delivered to their most needy neighbours; and if they be provided for, then to the reparation of highways next adjoining[1].' For proof that the repair of public roads was regarded as a work of Christian charity at a date before the Church of England had rejected the supremacy of Rome, we need not go further back than to a sermon of Latimer preached at Cambridge as early as 1529. 'Oblations,' he said, 'be prayers, alms-deeds, or any work of charity: these be called oblations to God.' And again, 'Evermore bestow the greatest part of thy goods in works of mercy, and the less part in voluntary works. Voluntary works be called all manner of offering in the Church, except your four offering-days and your tithes. Setting up candles, gilding and painting, building of churches, giving of ornaments, going on pilgrimages, *making of highways*, and such other, be called voluntary works; which works be of themselves marvellous good and convenient to be done[2].'

In this passage from Latimer, the word 'oblations' is used in a wide sense, and in that wide sense it included 'alms-deeds.' But the passage from Hooker shows how it was also used more particularly with reference to offerings made towards the maintenance of the clergy[3].

It has already been pointed out that in all the editions of the English Prayer Book up to 1662 there stood, immediately after the rubric respecting the offering or gathering of the devotion of the people at the Holy Communion, a rubric enjoining that upon 'the offering-days appointed every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.' But while this rubric was omitted in the Prayer Book of 1662, the offertory sentences referring to the maintenance of the clergy were retained; and for the first time in 1662 we have in this place the *express* mention of 'alms for the poor *and other devotions* of the people.' This change suggests the thought that the revisers of the Prayer Book in 1661, while no longer seeming to enforce the practice of the payment of 'dues' on offering-days (which, it would seem, had fallen into desuetude), kept in view the possibility of the collection at the offertory being made use of, in more or less degree, for the support of the clergy. The 'other devotions' of the rubric and the 'oblations' of the following prayer would cover and include this application of money collected, as well as other applications to pious uses.

---

[1] This order is repeated in Elizabeth's *Injunctions* (1559). See Cardwell, *Documentary Annals* i 190.

[2] *Sermons* (Parker Society) pp. 17, 23.

[3] The frequent association together of the two terms 'alms' and 'oblations' must have been inevitable for men familiar with their Latin Bible. See *Acts* xxiv 17 'Eleemosynas facturus in gentem meam veni et oblationes' &c.

Again, it is worth observing that up to 1662 there existed a rubric before the offertory which especially emphasized that the destination of the money about to be collected was for the poor. From 1552 (inclusive) onwards to 1662 we find the rubric 'After such Sermon, Homily, or Exhortation the Curate shall declare unto the people whether there be any holy days or fasting days the week following, *and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor*, *saying one or more of these sentences following*, as he thinketh most convenient by his discretion.' Now with this rubric before them, the Puritan divines at the time of the Savoy Conference very pertinently and justly raised the 'exception,' 'four of them' [i.e. of the following scripture sentences] are 'more proper to draw out the people's bounty to their ministers than their charity to the poor [1].' The answer of the Bishops to the exception of the Ministers runs simply, 'The sentences tend all to exhort the people to pious liberality, whether the object be the minister or the poor [2].' But the attention of the Bishops had been called to the matter, and we find the rubric about 'earnestly exhorting the people to remember the poor' struck out. And thus one particular destination of the offertory was no longer especially emphasized. But the revisers of 1662 did more than this: they for the *first* time wrote in the offertory rubric that the persons appointed to collect should 'receive the alms for the poor *and other devotions* of the people.' And yet further, they added at the close of the service the rubric 'After the Divine Service ended, the money given at the offertory shall be disposed of to such pious *and* charitable uses as the Minister and Church-wardens shall think fit.'

And now we feel we are approaching the answers to the questions with which we commenced this section of our subject. The attention of the Bishops had been drawn to a certain inconsistency between the formerly existing rubric directing an earnest exhortation to give to the poor and four of the sentences which referred to the support of the ministry. They defended the use of these four offertory sentences, but they deleted the rubric which suggested the 'exception' raised by the Puritan divines.

---

[1] Cardwell's *History of Conferences* &c. p. 318, 2nd edit.

[2] Cardwell *ut sup.* p. 353.

The distinction between alms and other offerings collected from the people was pressed upon them. What more natural then than that they should add to the word *alms*, in the prayer for their acceptance, the wider term *oblations*, with reference to offerings for 'pious uses,' as the former word had reference to 'charitable uses'?

Once again, it should be remembered that in the Prayer Book of 1662, in which the word 'oblations' occurs for the first time in the prayer, we also find for the first time a ritual and ceremonial presentation at the Holy Table of the money collected. Up to that time the practice had been first (from 1549 to 1552), while the clerks were singing the Offertory those who were disposed offered 'unto the poor men's box, every one according to his ability and charitable mind,' and afterwards (from 1552 to 1662), instead of the members of the congregation each going up and making his offering, 'the Churchwardens or some other by them appointed' gathered 'the devotion of the people and put the same into the poor men's box.' In 1662 it was sought in a ceremonial way to bring out the truth that the devotions of the people were really offerings to God. The word 'oblations' would indeed have been appropriate if it had occurred in the earlier Prayer Books; but the thoughts of those who brought the book to its present shape were now more directly turned to this aspect of the truth. And this may have possibly contributed to the feeling which introduced the word 'oblations' into the prayer.

III. Hitherto I have been dealing mainly with the texts and rubrics of successive editions of the Book of Common Prayer, and with the history of the last revision. I would now go on to notice illustrations of our subject from other sources, chiefly belonging to the seventeenth century.

At the time of the negotiations about the projected marriage of Prince Charles with the Infanta of Spain, Wren was appointed to go to Madrid as one of the Prince's chaplains. Whether the regulations for the services at Madrid were drawn up by Wren does not appear. Among the regulations we find, 'That the Communion be celebrated in due form with *an oblation* of every communicant[1].'

In 1635 Bishop Field, acting under a commission from Bishop Wren, consecrated the Parish Church of Abbey Dore in Herefordshire. The service for the consecration is preserved in manuscript in the British Museum, and was printed by Mr. Fuller Russell in 1874. This has been referred to both by Dean Howson and Canon Simmons, and the latter, with a candour which may be expected from, but is not always found in, controversial writers, adduces from it a passage which makes very distinctly for the interpretation of the word 'oblations' for which we have been contending. It confirms me in a supposition to which I have been led that (however unreasonable it may appear) there was some feeling of dislike to using the word 'oblation' in connexion with the bread and wine, even when they were said to be 'offered,' although the noun-substantive is derived directly from the participial form of the verb. Canon Simmons thus describes the part of the service with which we are concerned: 'At the offertory, after the sentence "Let your light so shine" &c., the bishop "offers and lays upon the table first his act of consecration." He likewise "layeth on the table" certain conveyances in law for the erection and dotation of the church and rectory. "Then . . . the bishop offereth [the bread and wine] also." "The priest treatably proceedeth to read other of the sentences, especially those *that are for the oblations, and not for the alms*, viz. the second ['Lay not for yourselves' &c.], the sixth ['Who goeth a warfare' &c.] . . . &c. All the while the chaplain standeth before the Table, and receiveth the *oblations* of all that offer."' It would perhaps be impossible to find anything more pertinent to the discussion before us. It uses the word 'oblations' in the restricted sense of money-offerings which were not 'alms,' although the word 'offer' had been used of the presentation of the document containing the deed of consecration of the church and also of the bread and wine. In the following prayer the word 'oblations' alone (without 'alms') was used.

---

[1] *State Papers*, Spain, March 10, 1623.

Some ten years earlier the same Bishop Field had taken part in a still more elaborate and ceremonious function, the coronation of King Charles I at Westminster (February 2, 1626). The service for the Coronation has been recently printed by the Henry Bradshaw Society, under the editorship of Canon C. Wordsworth. Early in the service 'the king maketh his first oblation,' consisting of a pall and a pound of gold. After the Nicene Creed the king 'offers' bread and wine for the Communion, and after that comes, what in Sancroft's interlineation is called 'the second oblation,' consisting of 'a mark [i.e. eight ounces Troy] of gold,' 'offered by the king[1].'

To understand the next quotation, which is from Bishop Andrewes, it is necessary to remember the form of the rubric upon which Andrewes commented. It ran as follows: 'Then shall the Churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor men's box, and upon the offering-days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.' Andrewes remarks: 'They should not pay it to the Curate alone, but to God upon the altar[2].' This points to Andrewes' sense of the lack of a solemn and ritual presentation before God of the oblations made on the offering-days, which sentiment found expression as regards both alms and other offerings in the amended rubric of 1662.

It was, I take it, with a feeling for the distinction between alms and other money-offerings that Andrewes, in his own practice, adopted what would seem to us nowadays a rather strange ceremony. Bishop Buckeridge, in the sermon preached at the funeral of Andrewes, says: 'He [Andrewes] kept monthly communions inviolably . . . In which his carriage was not only decent and religious, but also exemplary; *he ever offered twice* at the Altar, and so did every one of his servants, to which purpose he gave them money lest it should be burdensome to them[1].' And by a piece of singular good fortune Prynne has preserved, in his *Canterburie's Doome*, Andrewes' inventory of the furniture, plate, &c., of his chapel, which records the existence of two basons, one for 'alms,' and another for 'offerings[2].'

---

[1] All these features appear in the service as used at the coronation of Queen Victoria. Her 'first oblation' was a 'Pall or Altar-Cloth of Gold . . . and an Ingot or Wedge of Gold of a pound weight.' At the proper time she 'offers Bread and Wine for the Communion.' Then, after a prayer said by the Archbishop, the Queen makes her 'second [not her third] Oblation,' viz. 'a Purse of Gold. . . . And the Archbishop coming to her receives it into the Bason and places it upon the Altar.' A special prayer for the acceptance of 'these oblations' follows. See Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia* (2nd edit.) ii pp. 94 and 137.

[2] *Minor Works* p. 155.

A passage anticipating the practice of receiving the offerings of the people in a bason, as enjoined in 1662, will be found in the Form of Consecration of Jesus Chapel at Southampton used by Andrewes on September 17, 1620. And it may first be recorded that among other prayers offered up by the Bishop, *flexis genibus ante sacram mensam*, 'for all Thy servants who shall come into this Thy holy temple,' we find the following, 'When they offer, that their *oblation and alms* may come up as a memorial before Thee, and they find and feel that with such sacrifices Thou art well pleased.' The allusions to Acts x 4 and Heb. xiii 16 show what was in the mind of Andrewes when he spoke of *oblation and alms*. Later on we find the rubric directing as follows: 'populus universus non communicaturus dimittitur, et porta clauditur. Prior sacellanus pergit legendo sententias illas hortatorias ad eleemosynas, interea dum alter sacellanus singulos communicaturos adit, atque in patinam argenteam oblationes colligit; collecta est summa 4*l.* 12*s.* 2*d.*, quam dominus episcopus convertendam in calicem huic capellae donandum decernit[3].'

In 1641 the House of Lords appointed a *Committee of Religion* 'touching innovations in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; together with considerations upon the Book of Common Prayer.' Among the results of the proceedings of this committee we find noted 'among innovations in discipline': 'By introducing an offertory before the communion, distinct from the giving of alms to the poor[4].'

---

[1] Printed in *Andrewes' Sermons* v p. 296 (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology).

[2] 'Plate for the Chappell—

Two Candlesticks gilt for tapers	60	ounces at	5*s.* 6*d.*	the ounce.
A round Bason for Offerings, gilt and chased	31½	,,	6*s.* 8*d.*	,,
A round Bason for Almes, gilt and chased	30	,,	6*s.* 0*d.*	,,'

Canterburie's Doome (1646) p. 124.

[3] Andrewes' *Pattern of Catech. Doctrne* &c. (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.) pp. 317, 326.

[4] See Cardwell's *Conferences* &c. p. 273.

At the trial of Laud there was cited against him from the volume entitled the *Select Statutes of the University of Oxford* 1638 (p. 79) an ordinance as to the ceremonies to be observed 'in die Comitiorum,' where it is directed that at St. Mary's 'primum Vice-Cancellarius, postea singuli Inceptores in Facultatibus, deinde Procuratores, Bedellis praeeuntibus, ad Mensam Eucharistiae sacram, cum debita reverentia, *oblationes faciant*[1].' The passage is cited here only to illustrate the use of the word 'oblations,' and the practice, apparently, of the oblations being presented at the holy table.

Matthew Wren, bishop, successively, of Hereford, Norwich and Ely, was regarded as one of the liturgical experts of the Anglican Church in the seventeenth century. He was early in life chaplain to Bishop Andrewes. And it will be remembered that the *Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland* (1637) had the advantage of his criticism before its issue. After some eighteen or nineteen years' imprisonment in the Tower, he resumed his place among the bishops at the Restoration. Though his name does not appear among the bishops who sat at the Savoy Conference, he was one of the eight appointed, November 21, 1661, as a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Now in the directions given by Wren on the occasion of his Primary Visitation of Norwich in 1636 we find, 'That the holy oblations, in such places where it pleaseth God at any time to put it into the hearts of his people by that holy action to acknowledge his gift of all they have to them, and their tenure of all from, and their debt of all to, him, be received by the minister standing before the table at their coming up to make the said oblation, and there by him to be reverently presented before the Lord and set upon the table till the service be ended[2].' It does not appear whether this was distinct from the presentation of the alms or not. Attention is drawn simply to the use of the word *oblation* as applied to what is evidently an offering in money, and to the *oblation* being reverently presented and set on the table.

The late Bishop Jacobson, of Chester, did good service to the historical study of the Prayer Book by publishing, in 1874, his volume entitled *Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer from manuscript sources.* In this volume may be seen some notes upon the Prayer Book written by Wren with a view to its revision. These notes, as we can infer from his introductory remarks, were written about 1660 or 1661. The notes are throughout full of interest to the student; but I am now concerned only with those relating to the subject in hand. Wren suggests that after 'the Banns for Matrimony' have been published, the minister shall 'signify the contents of such Briefs as are brought to the Parish, for Collections.' The proposed rubric then proceeds, 'And then he shall say, Hear now the Monitions of the Holy Ghost, as it is written, naming the Chapter and Verse whence it is taken, and reading one or more, as he shall think meet in his discretion.' Wren then groups the offertory sentences into three classes: the first seven suited 'in general for all kind of Charitable Gifts.' 'The seven next,' he says (and to this special attention is invited), 'tend particularly to that which they called *Prosphora* in the Primitive Church, that is a freewill Offering unto God,' and the six last especially 'for the *Eleemosyna*, that is, our Alms Deeds to the Poor.' First, it will be noted that there is no hint of the large interpretation which some would give to the word *alms* as it occurs in the Prayer Book, viz. as a word that might include the gifts for pious uses and the support of the clergy. Secondly, let us see what Wren had in mind when he wrote the liturgical word *Prosphora.* This we can gather from the sentences which he appropriates thereto. The first is 'Lay not for yourselves treasures upon earth' &c.; the second is 'Charge them that are rich' &c.; the third is 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you' &c.; the fourth is 'Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things' &c.; the fifth is 'While we have time let us do good unto all men' &c.; the sixth is 'Blessed be the man that provideth for the sick and needy' &c. [the word 'sick,' as I should suppose, suggesting to Wren that this sentence belongs rather to *Prosphora* than to the *Eleemosyna*]; and the seventh is 'Be merciful after thy power' &c.

---

[1] Prynne's *Canterburie's Doome* p. 72.

[2] Wilkins' *Concilia* iv 526; Cardwell's *Documentary Annals* ii 205.

But Wren had also in view *Prosphora* designed for the support of the clergy. Among the Scripture sentences which he tells us 'tend particularly to what they called *Prosphora* in the Primitive Church' appears the sentence 'Do ye not know that they which minister' &c. (1 Cor. ix 13). Why Wren chose to use the word *Prosphora* rather than oblations is matter for conjecture. I suspect it may have been because the word 'oblations' had been in former times so emphatically used for 'dues,' or moneys recoverable at law. But, however this may be, it is plain that his language lends no countenance to the notion that the word 'alms' was in his day regarded as properly applicable to money given for the support of the clergy. The main point, however, to which I would direct attention is that Wren, like other divines of that period, had prominently in view the giving of *Prosphora* as distinct from *Alms*.

We now proceed to consider the view of another liturgical authority of that day. Eminent as were Andrewes and Wren in this department of research, Cosin's active influence on the last revision makes his way of regarding this matter more especially valuable. In the second series of his Notes[1], commenting on 'the offering-days' he writes, 'Which order is in some places among us still observed. And the king or queen in their chapel-royal (or wherever they be at church on those days) never omit it, but arise from their seats, and go in solemn manner to present their offerings upon their knees at God's altar. And then is read by the priest or bishop attending this sentence here prescribed, 1 Cor. ix. "They which minister about holy things"' &c.

Now it is to Cosin's notes, as corrected by him in the hand of Sancroft, his chaplain, that the Prayer Book of 1662 owes the words 'the alms and *other devotions of the people*[2].' And after what has been shown as to Cosin's view of the importance of a ritual presentation of money-offerings other than alms for the poor, a presumption is raised that he understood 'oblations' (in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church') in this sense. But we can advance beyond presumptions, for we are so fortunate as to possess a Service used by Cosin at the Consecration of Christ Church, Tynemouth, July 5, 1668, that is six years after the last revision; and this is the more important because Cosin in that

---

[1] *Works* vol. v p. 324 (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).

[2] See Parker's *Introduction* &c. p. cxcviii.

Service actually introduced the *offering* of the bread and wine for the Communion which had been rejected at the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer. After the offering of the bread and wine the rubric of Cosin's Consecration Service directs the Bishop to offer 'his own *alms and oblations*.' '¶ Then one of the priests shall receive the *alms and oblations*.' Here the phrase 'alms and oblations,' twice used, signifies, beyond all question, something distinct from the bread and wine[1]. Can it be contended with any show of reason that the very same phrase used immediately afterwards in the prayer refers to something different and wider, to something that includes also the bread and wine? To my mind this Consecration Service of Cosin goes to support the view that, even if Cosin had succeeded, where we know he failed, in introducing the word 'offer' (in 1661) as applied to the bread and wine, it would still, from the historical view-point, be insufficiently established that the phrase 'alms and oblations' in the prayer was *intended* to include the bread and wine.

Anthony Sparrow is said to have first published his well-known *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer* in 1643. Two editions, at any rate, were published before the issue of our present Prayer Book[2]. And the editions of the work that appeared during his lifetime, subsequent to 1662, were not throughout brought up to date. We find in the later editions of the book no notice of the insertion of the word 'oblations' in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church'; but we have some notices that illustrate how he was accustomed to understand the word 'oblations' in connexion with the offertory. Some importance attaches to his testimony, as he was appointed one of the episcopal 'coadjutors' at the Savoy Conference.

Sparrow, in his commentary on the offertory, speaks at length on the Christian duty of making oblations. 'Offerings or oblations are a high part of God's service and worship taught by the light of nature and right reason, which bids us to "honour God with our substance."' 'Our Saviour hath carefully taught us there [in the Gospel, Matt. v 23, 24] the due manner of the performance of this duty of oblations, like as He did concerning alms and prayers.' He reminds his readers how the Gospel commended the offering of 'gold, frankincense and myrrh' by the wise men. He tells them that 'though oblations be acceptable at any time, yet at some times they have been thought more necessary, as (1) When the Church is in want, Exod. xxxv 4 &c. ['whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring it, an offering, gold, and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet' &c.]; (2) when we have received some signal and eminent blessing from God, Psalm lxxvi . . .; (3) at our high and solemn festival, "three times in the year shall they appear before Me, and they shall not appear empty," especially when we receive the Holy Communion.'

---

[1] The Consecration Service here referred to will be found in *The Correspondence of Bishop Cosin* (part ii), edited for the Surtees Society by Rev. George Ormsby. Canon Simmons suggests that this Consecration Service was very probably that 'which the bishop was commanded to draw up by the unanimous vote of the united Upper Houses of Convocation on March 22, 166½': see the Acts and Proceedings of Convocation as printed in Cardwell's *Synodalia* vol. ii p. 668.

[2] Allibone records the dates 1643, '55, '57, '61: but of the editions of 1643 and 1655 no copy appears to be known. See note on p. 346 below.

A pertinent illustration of how 'alms' and 'oblations' were distinguished by writers of the Church of England, not long before the last revision of the Prayer Book, will be found in Henry Hammond's *View of the New Directory and Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, which appeared first in 1645. Having dwelt at some length on the origin of the offertory, Hammond proceeds, 'Now that this offering of Christians to God for pious and charitable uses[1] designed to them who are His proxies and deputy-receivers, may be the more liberally and withal more solemnly performed, many portions of Scripture are by the Liturgy designed to be read, to stir up and quicken this bounty, and those of three sorts, some belonging to *good works in general*, others to *alms-deeds*, others to *oblations*; and when it is received and brought to the priest he humbly prays God to accept those *alms*[2].' It will be remembered that at the date of Hammond's writings 'alms' alone stood in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church': and it is easy to understand that it would be felt by those who drew these distinctions a gain if some more general word or words were added to 'alms' in the prayer.

A little later than Hammond's *View of the New Directory* &c. we have Hamon L'Estrange commenting on the sentence 'Who goeth a warfare' &c. in the following way. 'This with the four succeeding sentences, 7, 8, 9, 10, have a peculiar reference to the ministry; by which plain it is that our Church intended a double offering—one *eleemosynary*, *alms* for the poor—another *oblatory*, for the maintenance of the clergy[1].' L'Estrange regarded the bread and wine as 'oblations,' yet it is plain, after reading the passage cited above, that it would be hazardous to suppose that his opinion in this respect countenanced the notion that in the phrase 'alms and oblations' we have a reference to anything else than the two parts of the 'double offering' of which he speaks. A few lines after the passage quoted L'Estrange writes, 'In the earliest times such spontaneous *oblations* were the only income of the Church, with no other alimony did the ministry subsist. . . . And though Christian princes restored, in after time, to God his own, and endowed the Church with tithes, yet did not these *oblations* cease thereupon.'

---

[1] Observe the distinction.

[2] *Works* (edit. 1674) vol. i part ii p. 154.

We must content ourselves with only one other testimony from the writers immediately preceding the Prayer Book Revision of 1661. But that testimony is weighty. As is well known, when the use of the Book of Common Prayer came to be forcibly proscribed during the Great Rebellion, various attempts were made by churchmen to supply its place, as best they could, with forms that were not included under the terms of the proscription. Among these attempts perhaps the most interesting is Jeremy Taylor's *Collection of Offices, or Forms of Prayer, in cases ordinary and extraordinary* &c. (1658). Now in his *Office or Order for the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, contained in this volume, there is a rubric directing 'a collection for the poor . . . while the minister reads some of these sentences or makes an exhortation to *charity and almes*.' At that particular juncture of affairs the clergy of the Church of England might well be spoken of as 'the poor'; but, at any rate, we find among the appointed sentences, 'Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth' &c. Then comes the rubrical direction, after the minister hath 'received it from the hand of him that gathered it, let him in a humble manner present it to God, laying it on the Communion Table, secretly and devoutly saying, 'Lord, accept the *oblation and almes* of thy people' &c. It should be added that there is no mention of any previous presentation of the elements. Here then, some three or four years previous to the last revision of the Prayer Book, we find in effect an almost exact anticipation of both the ceremonial presentation of the money offerings and also of the language of the following prayer[1].

---

[1] *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.) p. 274. The first edition of *The Alliance* was published in 1659.

From the passages cited from the English divines prior to the last revision of the Prayer Book, it would appear that the word 'oblations,' when used in connexion with 'alms,' refers to money offerings destined (as distinct from 'alms,' or money for the relief of the poor) for pious uses of any kind, and, perhaps, more particularly for the maintenance of the clergy.

IV. Something may, in conclusion, be said of the sense in which the word 'oblations' in the prayer was understood subsequently to the last revision. We have already noticed (see p. 339) how Cosin used the word in 1668, in the Consecration Service for Christ Church, Tynemouth. Of not less importance are Archbishop Sancroft's Visitation Articles of the year 1686. Among the queries we find—

'When the Holy Communion is administered amongst you, are the alms and oblations of devout persons duly collected and received?

'Are they constantly disposed of to pious and charitable uses by the consent of the ministers and churchwardens, or, if they disagree, by the appointment of the Ordinary?[2]'

It should be remembered that Sancroft had acted as clerk to Convocation during the proceedings which concerned the last revision of the Prayer Book, and there could have been few who were in a better position to know how the phrase 'alms and oblations' was to be understood.

A few words must be said as to what may be gathered from the French, Greek, and Latin translations of the Prayer Book in the reign of Charles II.

---

[1] The *Collection of Offices* will be found in Taylor's *Works* (Eden's edit.) vol. viii 571 ff.

[2] Appendix to the second report of the Royal Commission on Ritual, p. 624.

It would be easy to attach too much weight to the testimony of Durel's translation of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 into French. Charles II had ordered (Oct. 6, 1662) that when printed, and approved by one of the chaplains of the Bishop of London, it should be exclusively used in the parish churches of Jersey and Guernsey and in the French congregation of the Savoy &c. Dr. George Stradling, chaplain to the Bishop of London, certified (April 6, 1663) that Durel's version was in accordance throughout with the English original; yet, as a matter of fact, an examination of the contents of the book shows that Dr. Stradling's certificate was not justified. The version is inaccurate and faulty in many places. It serves, however, to show that Durel, and presumably Stradling, did not understand by the word 'oblations' the offering of the bread and wine[1]. The words of the prayer are rendered 'Nous te supplions bien-humblement qu'il te plaise [* *accepter nos aumosnes et nos oblations et*] recevoir nos Prieres' &c. And the marginal note ran, '* Ceci sera omis lors qu'il n'y aura point d'aumosne.' Durel seems to have failed, at this time (though he afterwards in his Latin version corrected himself), to draw any distinction between 'alms' and 'oblations.' When there were no 'alms' the words of receiving 'our alms and oblations' were to be omitted.

Duport's Greek version (1665), published at Cambridge by the University printer, John Field, and dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, is equally faulty here, but shows that while the translator made no distinction between 'alms' and 'oblations,' he did not understand the latter word to refer to the bread and wine. *Ταπεινοφρόνως ἀντιβολοῦμέν σε* [**τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ προσφορὰς ἡμῶν*] *καὶ ταύτας τὰς προσευχάς κ.τ.λ.*, with the marginal note, **Ἐὰν οὐδεμία ἐλεημοσύνη ποιηθῇ, χρὴ παραλείπειν ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα (τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ προσφορὰς ἡμῶν).*

The French translation of Durel was plainly a hurried piece of work. Much superior is the Latin version which appeared under his name in 1670, and which probably incorporates some of the work of Earle, Pearson, and Dolben. The rubric immediately after the sentences for the offertory shows us how he understood the words in question. It runs thus: 'Dum ista recitantur, Diaconi, Aeditui, aliive ad hoc idonei, quibus illud muneris demandatum est, Eleemosynam in pauperum usus erogatam colligent, ut et alias populi oblationes in pios usus, in Amulâ seu lance idoneâ' &c.: while in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church' we have, both in the body of the prayer and in the marginal note, 'eleemosynas atque oblationes nostras.' It is quite evident that the translator, or translators, of this part of the Prayer Book regarded the 'oblations' of the prayer as meaning the same thing as the 'other devotions of the people' in the rubric[1].

---

[1] Stradling had subscribed the MS copy of the Book of Common Prayer attached to the Act of Uniformity in his capacity as Proctor in Convocation of the clergy of the diocese of Llandaff.

Thomas Comber's *Companion to the Temple* was, I think, the first systematic commentary on the Prayer Book written after the last revision[2]. The following passage may be cited from his *Paraphrase of the Prayer for the whole Church:*

'**We humbly** disclaiming our own merits **beseech thee** for Jesus' sake and by the Virtue of his Passion here set forth **most mercifully** *to accept this poor acknowledgement of thy bounty, and testimony of our love in these* **our Alms** *to the Poor* **and Oblations** *to thy Ministers*, intreating thee also' &c. In the margin Comber, referring to the words in italics, has the note 'This to be omitted when there is no collection.' And elsewhere, commenting on the sentences at the offertory, he tells us that St. Cyprian and the ancient canons show that 'the clergy were chiefly maintained out of the oblations made at the Communion.' From these passages it is plain how Dean Comber understood the word 'oblations.'

Patrick, on the other hand, as we have seen (p. 322), understood 'oblations' to signify the elements. But a passage in his popular work the *Christian Sacrifice* (which appeared after

---

[1] Lord Selborne (*Notes on some passages in the Liturgical History of the Reformed English Church* p. 73) considers that the dedication of this Latin version to the king suggests that it had public authority, and adds, 'There seems to be some reason to believe that this may be the Latin translation which was made under the direction of Convocation, as recorded in its Acts of April 26, 1662, and May 18, 1664, because it can hardly be supposed that a version made under such auspices would have been entirely suppressed, and the work of a private translator preferred.' But I do not claim official authority for the book.

[2] The third part of this work, dealing with the Communion Office, appeared in 1675.

Mensa Mystica) makes it plain that he had come to this view rather as inference of his own than from any knowledge of the intentions of those who in 1661 inserted the word 'oblations' in the prayer. 'These ["alms" and "oblations"] are things distinct; and the former (alms) signifying that which was given for the relief of the poor, the latter (oblations) can signify nothing else but (according to the style of the ancient church) this bread and wine presented to God in a thankful remembrance of our food both dry and liquid (as Justin Martyr speaks), which he, the Creator of the world, hath made and given unto us[1].' Those who have read the quotations cited from our earlier divines are in a position to judge whether the word 'oblations,' in this connexion, '*can signify nothing else*.' Bishop Patrick's opinion then is in truth not in any sense an historical testimony as to the commonly accepted meaning of the word when he wrote; and that he expressed himself in this way points probably to the offertory having, as a matter of fact, ceased to be utilized for other objects than the relief of the poor, except in rare instances[2].

In the eighteenth century Patrick's view was adopted by Wheatly in his *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, and the deserved popularity of that useful book gave his interpretation of the word 'oblations' a wide currency. Similarly Archdeacon Sharp, in his *Visitation Charge* for 1735, accepts this view, though in a somewhat halting manner, for while he considers that the word 'oblations' refers to the bread and wine, he adds, 'I apprehend the word *oblations*, inserted in the prayer, may be consistently applied to a portion of the collection in the bason, viz. such share as shall be appropriated to acts of piety[3].'

Canon Simmons, in his article in the *Churchman* for June, 1882, also adopts the view of this double application of the term. It may now be left to the reader to judge, not whether the words of the prayer may be privately glossed so as to include a reference to the elements (which is a question quite beyond the scope of the present paper), but whether the language of the Prayer Book and the historical evidence here adduced show that the intention of the revisers of 1661, in using the phrase 'alms and oblations,' was to signify (*a*) 'alms and other money offerings for pious uses,' or (*b*) 'alms and the bread and wine,' or (*c*) 'alms and money for pious uses and also the bread and wine.' It will be seen that my own view is in favour of the first of these opinions [1].

---

[1] *The Works of Symon Patrick* (Oxford edit. 1858) i 377.

[2] The view put forward by Patrick was eagerly accepted by the leading non-jurors and those of their school, such as Hickes (*The Christian Priesthood asserted* chap. ii § 10), and John Johnson (*Works* ii 386, Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).

[3] *The Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer* &c. p. 76 (Oxford edit. 1834).

JOHN DOWDEN.

---

[1] I may be permitted to add that a ceremonial offering of the bread and wine seems to me a primitive and edifying rite; and, as is well known, it is expressly enjoined in the Scottish Communion Office; but I have concerned myself solely with the historical problem as to what is the true sense of the word 'oblations' in the English Book of Common Prayer. The examination of the question in the 'dry light' of facts has not been common; but it is a satisfaction to me to find that the view I have maintained is that which has been arrived at by such careful and cold-blooded historical students as Dr. Cardwell (*History of Conferences*, 2nd edit., p. 382), Mr. F. Procter (*History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 18th edit., p. 369), and Canon James Craigie Robertson (*How shall we conform to the Liturgy?* 2nd edit., pp. 204-209).

[NOTE ON THE EARLY EDITIONS OF SPARROW'S *RATIONALE*.

The British Museum and Magdalen College, Oxford, possess the edition of 1661: the Bodleian, Queens' College Cambridge (see *Dict. Nat. Biogr.* s.v. Sparrow), and the Rev. H. A. Wilson of Magdalen College, possess the edition of 1657. But though Watt mentions an edition of 1655, and Lowndes and Allibone editions of both 1643 and 1655 (Lowndes' 1622 is a misprint for 1722), no copy of either, according to the *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, is extant. On the other hand I find that the engraving of Andrewes—which is contained in the Bodleian copy of 1657, the Magd. Coll. copy of 1661, and a Bodleian copy of 1676—is signed *W. Hollar fecit* 1643, and this may have suggested that it was made for an edition of that year. The companion portrait of Overall in the same copies is signed *W. Hollar fec.* 1657: the portraits of Hooker are not dated at all.

In the edition of 1661 immediately after the preface—in the edition of 1676 both at the beginning of the book after the preface and at the end of the book after the index—in the edition of 1722 at the end only (p. 270)—is given a letter of Sparrow's in answer to certain 'liturgical demands,' of which I quote the last section as illustrating the subject of 'Alms and Oblations':

'10. You tell me Newes, that a Latine copy of our Service-book, printed 2 *Eliz.* hath in it an office for a Communion at burials (*Celebratio Coenae Domini in Funebribus*, &c.). It is a Translation of some private pen, not licensed by Authority, as I guess; Communions by the direction of our Service are joyned with Morning Prayers, burials are mostly in the Afternoon. *Offertories* at Burials did last to be frequent (if they were considerable Funerals) to the middle of King *James* his Reign, the Ministers of Parishes keeping up the profit of oblations as long as they could; and these Offertories at Funerals are spoken of in the first Liturgy of King *Edward the VI.*'—ED. J. T. S.]

THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TENDENCIES IN NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.

THE controversy or conflict, as it is sometimes called, between Theology and Science, with a history extending over three or four centuries, has almost come to be regarded as one that will be always with us. And in so far as increase of knowledge inevitably involves adjustment of the new and restatement of the old, processes which again involve time, argument and effort, this assumption is probably true. But whether the estrangement from theistic forms of Theology, which has been so general amongst teachers of Natural Science during its period of remarkable growth and recognised dominance, will remain permanent as Science continues its endless work, is a question which may even now be profitably discussed, and not without hopefulness, perhaps, for those who notice with concern the widely prevalent alienation from the Christian Faith of men approaching it mainly or exclusively from the standpoint of empirical Science. For not only do the problems about which the naturalist and the theologian are at issue change somewhat from age to age, so that part of the Apologetics, scientific or theological, of one generation becomes antiquated and irrelevant in the next; but it would seem just now that to those who watch the movements and the developements of thought within the realm of Science itself, and try to discern the signs of the time, there are indications of the probable disappearance of the fundamental presuppositions upon which the naturalistic *Weltanschauung* is mainly built, and of an inevitable tendency towards a spiritualistic standpoint.

The object of the present essay is to endeavour to give some account of these movements or tendencies of thought. It is to be feared that their discussion will carry the reader rather into the province of Natural Philosophy than that of Theology; but on that score no apology perhaps is necessary. Certainly the struggle between Naturalism and Theism has to be fought on the ground of Natural Philosophy, and not on that of Theology which Naturalism declines to recognise; and the struggle is one in which Theology must engage if it is to commend itself to a large and increasing class of thinkers[1]. Apology, however, in some degree is due to readers of the *Gifford Lectures* recently published by Prof. Ward, for inviting their further attention here and there to points so lately and so suggestively dealt with by his master hand. But if the essay should assist in any degree to emphasize in their minds the importance of those points, or should be the means of directing more inquirers to his remarkable work, it will not have failed to accomplish a useful purpose. For since Agnosticism received its name or Naturalism entered on its present phase, no criticism of either has appeared so equally equipped for its work, so thoroughly at home on the adversary's ground, or so calculated to compel the attention and conviction of the man of Science.

Any account which can be given here of the theory of knowledge and existence which has been built up on the results of Science, and which, with no very great changes, has been especially prevalent for more than half a century amongst scientific students, must be somewhat brief[2]. Ontologically it may be avowedly materialistic, or, as is now much more commonly the case, materialistic in all the consequences of the dogmatic premiss of the sole substantiality of matter while repudiating the premiss itself. It may cling to the Dualism of which it is begotten, or favour the particular form of Monism which the difficulties of Materialism and the influence of Agnosticism have led it to create, or it may vacillate between the two. Before all it is mechanical and determinist; teleology and spontaneity are rigorously excluded. Hence it will be possible for its Theology to be atheistic or in some sense pantheistic, or it may adopt the simply agnostic attitude towards the Absolute which has been made popular by Herbert Spencer. It is utterly incompatible with any form of Theism. Psychologically it is atomistic and sensationalist; it denies the substantiality and activity of mind. Finally, with regard to epistemological positions, it maintains that knowledge originates solely in experience and has validity within that sphere alone; in other words it is empirical and positivist. Its objects (content) of knowledge are 'phaenomena,' but in consequence of some vagueness in the use of that term and some variety of opinion, the phaenomenalism in question is not easy to define. It is never Kantian; but in anxiety to escape from all implications of the noümenal it has exhibited two divergent tendencies. Of late there have been manifested signs of what might be called a nominalistic trend, but much more generally it sets its phaenomena in the place of the noümena which it has banished, makes them entirely objective, that is to say, and so becomes implicated in a naïve form of Realism.

---

[1] Cf. Balfour, *Foundations of Belief* pp. 1, 2: 'With the growth of knowledge Theology has enlarged its borders until it has included subjects about which even the most accomplished theologian of past ages did not greatly concern himself. . . . [The theologian of to-day] must be competent to deal with those scientific and philosophical questions which have a more profound and permanent bearing on Theology even than the results of critical and historical scholarship.'

[2] Its essential features, however, will be familiar to readers of Lewes, Tyndall, Huxley, Haeckel, H. Spencer, K. Pearson, &c., as well as of their critics. I do not imply that all who entertain what are commonly called naturalistic views are necessarily pledged to *all* the positions here enumerated.

Such is the skeleton of the philosophy which is popular with modern Science and widely known under the revived name of Naturalism. A few more words must suffice to give it body.

The whole system may be fairly regarded as an immense extension or developement of the mechanical theory which arose in the seventeenth century, at the birth of modern Science and Philosophy, to explain the motions of visible bodies. From the sphere of ordinary molar Mechanics it was applied to molecules, in whose quantitative mass-and-motion relations the qualitative properties of molar bodies, with which Mechanics is not concerned, were sought to be explained. Thus the various physical sciences were to be reduced, as Newton hoped, to branches of Mechanics. The only kind of 'action' between things allowed by the theory is contact-action, pressure or impact, by which motion is communicated; the only possible kind of change, change of motion. In fact these mechanical principles were assumed at the outset to be the only principles on which Nature could be made intelligible[1]. For the explanation, in accordance with them, of the phaenomena of Light, Electricity &c., the postulation of the ether or ethers was made, which offered the promise of still further generalisation in undertaking to supply an explanation of matter itself and its properties. A yet further extension included the phaenomena of life and mind within the scheme. Organisms came to be regarded as mechanisms, of great complexity indeed, but to be wholly explained in due course by the laws of mass and motion; mental processes were asserted to be dependent on, if not produced by, material processes; in no wise could it be allowed that the mental processes determined or influenced the material. Thus the progress of Science is to secure the complete banishment, as Huxley says, of spirit and spontaneity, and to reduce the universe to a vast mechanism never capable of deviating from obedience to rigid law. In such a universe there is no place for the theist's transcendent God, and all thought of purpose, end, meaning or worth is utterly irrelevant. The ideal to which Science tends is the ability to compute at any instant, past or future, the complete 'state' of the universe, could the world-equation be given for any other moment. The world, in fact, according to Naturalism, actually *is* this mechanism; or rather this mechanism of Science is actual and constitutes the universe. It is indeed only known as phaenomenal; but then that is all there is to know. Inasmuch as this phaenomenal world, however, for Naturalism, is independent of thinking subjects, it is regarded in the fullest sense as real. Time only is required for the working out of details and filling up of gaps in our knowledge of this world-machine. Ideally, Science has supplied us with a whole of accurate and positive knowledge, a system of Philosophy in which there is neither room nor need for Metaphysics or Theology.

---

[1] One of the very earliest to state this central doctrine of the mechanical theory was Hobbes. The whole of § 9 of his *Philosophia Prima*, cap. ix, is of so great historical interest that I take leave to quote it in full. 'Hoc posito, necesse est ut mutatio aliud non fit praeter partium corporis mutati motum. Primo enim mutari nihil dicimus praeterquam quod sensibus nostris aliter apparet quam ante apparuit. Secundo illae apparentiae sunt ambae effectus producti in sentiente; itaque si diversi sunt, necesse est per praecedentem, ut vel Agentis pars aliqua ante quiescens jam moveatur, & sic mutatio consistit in eo motu; vel ante mota, nunc aliter movetur, & sic quoque consistit mutatio in novo motu, vel ante mota nunc quiescat, quod fieri nisi per motum non posse supra demonstravimus, & ita rursus mutatio motus est, vel denique aliquid horum contingit patienti vel parti ejus, atque ita omni modo mutatio consistet in motu partium ejus corporis quod sentitur, vel ipsius sentientis, vel utriusque. Itaque mutatio, *motus* est (nimirum partium Agentis vel patientis) quod erat propositum demonstrare. Huic autem consequens est, quietem nullius rei causam esse, neque omnino per eum quicquam *agi*, ut quae neque motus, neque mutationis ullius causa sit' (ed. Andreae Crook, London, 1655).

As a description of the general features of a vast system within which there is scope for divergences of opinion more or less important, the above statements may be inadequate, but I hope, and indeed believe, that they are not misleading. I take them to represent the creed of a large number of fellow-students of Natural Science. And personally I am not surprised at the prevalence of the views which they assert. In saying that the vast majority of men absorbed in such studies have little inclination and little stimulation towards anything so near akin to Metaphysics as the examination of first principles, I do not think I shall be laying against them a charge which they would be anxious to repudiate. Yet here, as it seems to me, lies precisely the chief cause of the prevalence of Naturalism, the grounds of its plausibility with students of the natural sciences. The axioms, postulates, working-hypotheses and generalisations of Science, whatever else may have to be said of them, have proved brilliantly successful in the discovery and classification of the items of physical knowledge and the application of them to practical uses. Hence arises in the minds of those best fitted to appreciate their value, but not concerned to critically examine their absolute validity from the standpoint of Epistemology, a strong presumption in favour of their equal applicability for other purposes and in other fields. But Natural Science, as we shall presently see, is to be kept quite distinct from Natural Philosophy. That a postulate or a hypothesis, such, for instance, as that of the Conservation of Energy, should be fertile in good results and unproductive of error in the discovery and calculation of phaenomena, is not necessarily a warrant that it will be of universal validity when converted into a metaphysical principle. The splendour of the results of the scientific method in the investigation of Nature, enhanced as it is by the repeated failures of a Metaphysics of Nature, has captivated the mind not of scientific teachers alone[1], and has tended to produce an unbounded confidence in whatever comes to us with the imprimatur of Physical Science. Consequently it must almost of necessity predispose those whose minds have been occupied with Physics or Biology, to the exclusion of Psychology and theory of knowledge, to accept a philosophy claiming to be no more than solid science, 'science systematised, unified and completed.' The last things which the naturalist has hitherto been inclined to believe his system of Nature capable of containing are unsuspected assumptions, uncriticised presuppositions, unduly extended generalisations, which form no part of Science itself[1]. Yet we venture to say that such things are very obvious, once pointed out, when Natural Science passes over into Natural Philosophy. Moreover they are already being confessed at the headquarters of Science itself.

---

[1] Deference to Science and corresponding distrust of Metaphysics accounts for

Thus we are brought to our main purpose: to the discussion of certain tendencies in Science and certain movements in the thought of its exponents which appear to involve consequences disastrous to the naturalistic philosophy for which perhaps the very rapidity of the advance of Science has been responsible.

I. The first tendency which calls for notice is inherent in Science itself, is in fact involved in its inevitable developement towards what, since Newton's time, has been its goal. We have already said that the positivist or naturalistic philosophy is avowedly based upon and has grown out of Mechanics. It *is*, in fact, Mechanics supplemented by metaphysical assumptions and applied universally. Now a philosophy of Nature must be an account of the *actual* world. The Mechanics of which Naturalism is the fulfilment must therefore be a concrete science having contact with reality; the mechanism into which it would resolve the living

---

movements in Philosophy and Theology comparable with that described below as taking place in Natural Science. In the Critical Positivism of Prof. Riehl, for instance, we see Philosophy reduced to Science and Epistemology alone. A similar distrust of Metaphysics is implied in Balfour's *Foundations of Belief.* The influence of Ritschl in Germany is no doubt largely due to his promise to eliminate Metaphysics from Theology, involving the exclusion of the branches called Natural and Rational. Whether the permanent interests of Theology will not be better served by a critical examination of the first principles of Science before deferring too much to its positivist claims, time only will decide.

[1] Students of Haeckel and Herbert Spencer in particular will have been struck with the possibility of this naïve unconsciousness in recognised leaders of naturalistic philosophy.

world must be actual, and not merely conceptual. If, on the other hand, the Mechanics on which Naturalism builds is not a science of the actual, the Mechanical Theory, and consequently Naturalism, is no explanation of the world; it cannot claim to tell us what actually goes on.

But the whole tendency of Mechanics, through whatever stages it may have passed, has been to show itself to be an abstract science. 'As Mechanics has advanced its true character has become apparent[1],' and that character is not what the Mechanical Theory requires that it should be. Mechanics deals, like Mathematics or Ethics, with definitions and not at all with actual existences. It is, in fact, a branch of Mathematics. It culminates in resolving Matter into 'non-matter in motion' and passes into Kinematics. It is therefore easy to see that the Mechanical Theory, as Prof. Ward expresses it, has overreached itself; that in consequence of its tendency to become ever more kinematical it loses all that contact with reality which, in virtue of admixture of Metaphysics, it seemed to possess. Thus, instead of identifying the mechanisms with which Science deals with the actual structure of the actual world, and so justifying its claim to be simply 'Science systematized, unified and completed,' instead of revealing the universe to us as a machine of moving matter in which there is no room for spirit and spontaneity, it lands us in a Nirvana where all is motion but there is nothing to move. Such is the bitter end of self-completion at which the mechanical theory arrives if unchecked in the logical attainment of its natural developement. The very progress of Science has removed the foundations of the philosophy which has been too hastily built upon it.

So far then as Science is an extension of pure Mechanics, and retains the precision and quantitative exactness which its mathematical nature affords to it, it is abstract and hypothetical and stands apart from actuality. It has only gained its pretended concreteness and contact with the real world by a parasitic connexion with Metaphysics. Its concepts, such as force, mass, atom, ether, have become hypostatised or objectified by use of the categories of cause and substance of which Science should know nothing. It is only in this borrowed metaphysical dress that Science is available for the anti-metaphysical mechanical theory of Nature or the equally anti-metaphysical positivist theory of knowledge. Strip it of these non-scientific accretions and the only philosophy which it could furnish would be Nihilism. Thitherward both Science and Naturalism are inevitably led by the progress of Physics, if they would retain the mechanical theory as a metaphysical principle.

---

[1] Ward, *Gifford Lectures*. See chaps. i to v of vol. i, and compare Stallo, *Concepts of Physical Science*, especially chap. x, where the abstract nature of Mechanics is also pointed out. The argument against Naturalism given above aims at reproducing in outline the central portion of the highly elaborate argument of the chapters of the *Gifford Lectures* to which reference has been made.

II. Science, however, can save itself from this extremity by avowing its abstract nature, by renouncing every claim to be philosophy, by ejecting its metaphysical accretions, by professing only to *describe* and not to *explain* the course of Nature. And this step Science has already begun to take.

We may first observe the movement itself, and then endeavour to estimate its consequences for Naturalism, and therefore, indirectly, for Natural and Rational Theology. It is making progress amongst continental physicists, but appears to be little regarded in English scientific circles. This fact, and the importance of what the movement may involve, must justify my possibly erroneous assumption that it is not wholly familiar to English students of philosophical Theology, to whom it should be interesting.

In 1876 the late Prof. Kirchhoff of Berlin, famous for brilliant work in several branches of physical Science, published his well-known *Lectures on Mathematical Physics*. In the preface to this work he points out that he intends, for purely methodological reasons, to discontinue the accustomed use of the term *force* in the sense of cause, and to regard Mechanics simply as a *descriptive* science whose object is to describe the *how*, but not to explain the *why*, of motions. As the passage is likely to be regarded as an important *locus classicus*, it may be worth while to reproduce it in the original.

‘Man pflegt die Mechanik als die Wissenschaft von den *Kräften* zu definiren, und die Kräfte als die *Ursachen*, welche Bewegungen hervorbringen oder hervorzubringen *streben*. Gewiss ist diese Definition bei der Entwicklung der Mechanik von dem grössten Nutzen gewesen, und sie ist es auch noch bei dem Erlernen dieser Wissenschaft, wenn sie durch Beispiele von Kräften, die der Erfahrung des gewöhnlichen Lebens entnommen sind, erläutert wird. Aber ihr haftet die Unklarheit an, von der die Begriffe der Ursache und des Strebens sich nicht befreien lassen. . . . Aus diesem Grunde stelle ich es als die Aufgabe der Mechanik hin, die in der Natur vor sich gehenden Bewegungen zu *beschreiben*, und zwar vollständig und auf die einfachste Weise zu beschreiben. Ich will damit sagen, dass es sich nur darum handeln soll, anzugeben, *welches* die Erscheinungun sind, die stattfinden, nicht aber darum, ihre *Ursachen* zu ermitteln[1].'

Thus 'in half a page forces were defined away and physics made a really descriptive natural science[2].'

Similar views as to the nature of Science appear to have occurred to Prof. E. Mach, now of Vienna, before the publication of Kirchhoff's *Lectures*. To his work we shall presently recur. It may be mentioned meanwhile that Kirchhoff's suggestion to treat Mechanics as merely descriptive, and our present mechanical laws (Newton's) as provisional rather than universal, is not so much a new step as a return to primitive Science, to that of Copernicus[3], Galilei, Descartes[4], and Newton[5]. Fechner[6], moreover, had, twenty years previously, vindicated the scientific as opposed to the metaphysical usage of the concept of force. Nevertheless, it was Kirchhoff as a physicist calling the attention of physicists to the obscurity of 'force' as used in Mathematical Physics which soon aroused no mean portion of German scientists to realise that their science was much more imbued with Metaphysics than had been suspected, and that it was advisable in the interests of Science to purge out the metaphysical element whereto were attributed the difficulties and obscurities in which they had become involved.

---

[1] Kirchhoff, *Vorlesungen über Math. Physik*, 1876. Vorrede.

[2] Boltzmann, *Phil. Mag.* 36, p. 40.

[3] Copernicus, Pref. to *De Revol. Orbium caelestium* (quoted by Lewes, *Aristotle*, 1864, p. 92), '*Neque enim necesse est eas hypotheses esse veras, imo ne verisimile quidem, sed sufficit hoc unum, si calculum observationibus congruentem exhibeant.*'

[4] Descartes, *Principia*, IV, marginal summary of § 1, '*Que pour trouver les vraies causes de ce qui est sur la terre, il faut retenir l'hypothèse déjà prise, nonobstant qu'elle soit fausse.*' Compare also Bacon, *De Augmentis*, bk. iii ch. 4, '*which* (mathematical demonstrations) *indeed may show how to account for all these things, but not how they actually are in Nature: how to represent the apparent motions . . . and a system of machinery arbitrarily devised to produce them; but not the real causes and truth of things.*' This passage is quoted in K. Pearson's *Grammar of Science.*

[5] Newton, *Princ.* Def. viii (referring to Force), '*Mathematicus duntaxat est hic conceptus. Nam virium causas et sedes physicas jam non expendo.*' Newton's *Hypotheses non fingo* implies the same reluctance to make his Physics explanatory rather than descriptive. Jevons (*Principles of Science*, 1883, p. 515), in regarding this saying as 'bearing the appearance of irony,' was apparently under a misunderstanding similar to that of Leibniz, who regarded Newton as a re-introducer of occult qualities.

[6] Fechner, *Atomenlehre*, 1855, pp. 107–108. '*Kraft ist der Physik überhaupt weiter nichts als ein Hülfsausdruck zur Darstellung der Gesetze des Gleichgewichts und der Bewegung, und jede klare Fassung der physischen Kraft führt hierauf zurück . . . Sonne und Erde äussern eine Anziehungskraft auf einander, heisst nichts weiter als: Sonne und Erde bewegen sich im Gegenübertreten gesetzlich nach einander hin; nichts als das Gesetz kennt der Physiker von der Kraft.*'

Kirchhoff himself does not seem to have had any theoretical or metaphysical object in view in proposing his change of treatment; it was purely for convenience' sake, simply methodological. Not only have I failed to discover any philosophical writings by him, but I find that it is Prof. Mach's belief that he did not busy himself with *erkenntniss-kritischen Erörterungen*, and that 'his view rested on a mere *aperçu*[1].' Mach, however, acting, it may be, partly on a hint dropped by Dr. Tylor[2], who sees in the cruder scientific conception of force a possible trace of Animism, and in any case starting independently of Kirchhoff from a similar outlook upon Physics, has developed his suggestion into a plan for a thoroughgoing reform of the physical sciences. He aims at severing Natural Science from Natural Philosophy, handing the latter over to the metaphysicians, and making Science purely descriptive and symbolical instead of explanatory and realistic. A very short summary of his proposed reforms must suffice here; those who may be desirous of further acquaintance with his views are referred to his most interesting books[3]. He teaches that physical science is nothing more than an elaborate device for economy of thought, for comprehending as many facts as possible under the shortest descriptive formulae. Forces, atoms, ethers and laws of Nature are conceptual aids to thought, mere *Hülfsmittel* which must not be mistaken for the foundations of the real world. Force, as an efficient cause, is a fetish, an anthropomorphic survival, and the 'mechanical mythology' of scientific textbooks based upon it must go the way of the animistic and all other mythologies. The term 'force' must henceforth be redeemed from obscurity by its being only used to denote a rate of change of momentum. These views, originating on the continent, were first made accessible to English readers, so far as I have been able to ascertain, by Prof. Karl Pearson's *Grammar of Science*, which appeared in 1892. They are there developed and applied with great suggestiveness and skill, but are unfortunately intermingled with Psychology of so crude a kind as to greatly detract from the philosophical value of the book[1].

---

[1] This is gathered from a conversation between Kirchhoff and F. Neumann. See Mach's *Wärmelehre*, pp. 404–405. Compare also Paul du Bois-Reymond, *Ueber die Grundlagen der Erkenntniss in den exacten Wissenschaften*, p. 13. '*Kirchhoff selbst ist, wenigstens im Druck, nicht wieder auf diesen Punkt zurückgekommen.*' See also p. 15, note.

[2] *Primitive Culture*, vol. ii p. 160 (3rd ed.).

[3] *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwickelung; Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen; Wärmelehre.* The first two of these books, and also his *Popular Scientific Essays*, are translated into English. See also a few papers in *The Monist*.

From the vehemence of their language against the objectification of conceptual symbols, some of the leaders of this reform would seem to derive their iconoclastic zeal rather from antipathy to Metaphysics than love for Science. Nevertheless their work is equally valuable to both subjects. And furthermore, the mere separation of Natural Science from Metaphysics of Nature will serve to clear up much of the confusion of thought in consequence of which Theology has failed to always make good its claims to those absorbed in scientific studies. But before passing on to the indirect consequences of this movement for Theology, it may be well to observe more closely what it immediately involves for Science and Philosophy.

For Science it is a critical process; a process comparable to that which part of the Book of Genesis, for instance, has undergone at the hands of critics. Its teaching is being shown to be not history but parable. Its mechanisms and laws are reduced from metaphysical entities and principles to so much conceptual apparatus for descriptive use and economy of thought. Science, therefore, waives its right to speak upon ultimate reality, to offer any explanation or interpretation of things. It becomes only a pictorial memory system instead of a key to the hieroglyphic literature of Nature. Those who would exploit the results of Science in the cause of Naturalism must now reckon with the fact that Science cannot supply a philosophy without being metaphysical, whilst in allowing itself to be metaphysical it becomes obscure as science. Naturalism has always been more in favour with biologists, who receive their Physics ready-made, than with physicists who are concerned in the making of it ; and now we find the physicists declining to produce the metaphysical Mechanics which their biological companions have found indispensable for the naturalistic system.

---

[1] Space does not allow of a fuller description of this interesting movement. For further light on it see, besides Mach's works already referred to, Fick's *Ursache und Wirkung*; P. du Bois-Reymond, *Ueber die Grundlagen der Erkenntniss;* Ostwald, *Die Ueberwindung des wissenschaftlichen Materialismus;* Duhem, *Mécanique chimique*. Profs. Fick and du Bois-Reymond raise objection to Kirchhoff's treatment of Mechanics, but their objections are perhaps scarcely more than verbal. The other writers strongly support the new attitude.

The first consequence, then, of the Kirchhoffian movement to Naturalism is the loss of the mechanical theory as a philosophy of Nature. The second concerns its positivist theory of knowledge. Its claim that the 'positive' knowledge of the natural sciences is the only possible knowledge other than that of Mathematics, accompanied as it generally is by the further claim that such knowledge is adequate for the tasks which were wont to be undertaken by Metaphysics and Theology, comes to nought in the light of the new teaching. For scientific knowledge cannot be purely abstract and at the same time be knowledge of the actual world. With these two positions abandoned, as they must be if the new school of Science make its way, the obstacle which Naturalism has placed for many minds in the way of theistic arguments will be swept away.

And there is every reason to believe that this will be the case; that, once scientific investigators have found time and inclination for questions of first principles, the truth of the newer doctrines will find universal acceptance.

Of course the utility for philosophical purposes of this new tendency to regard Science as descriptive instead of explanatory will depend on the meaning which is to be assigned to the terms 'describe' and 'explain.' The latter word is used in so many different senses, some of which only differ in degree from the ordinary meaning of the former, that it is important to point out to what the verbal change really amounts. Description is primarily the reproduction of facts in words. The most direct description of the motion of a body, for instance, would consist in a series of statements as to the position of the body at different instants of time. The same information about such motion can also be conveyed by means of the equation to the curve which the body describes. Such an equation is a far shorter description of the motion, but is still no more than a description. Generally a description does not attempt to reproduce the whole of the facts. Rather is it abstract, from purely economical necessity, and represents the one side of the event which is of interest and importance for our *present* point of view. Scientific description, so often regarded as explanation, is of this abstract kind, as we have seen; it represents things or changes from a single and specialized point of view. When the description purposefully takes note of similarities and differences between the phaenomenon in question and others, pointing out identity amidst diversity—and every description necessarily does so to some extent—it has already passed into explanation according to a common usage of that term[1]. Science tends, of course, to make its descriptive formulae ever wider and fewer; each regressive step is spoken of as an explanation of the next more complex, so that explanation comes to mean very generally 'simplest possible description,' and a new phaenomenon is considered as explained when it has been compared and related with others more familiarly observed; when in fact the unknown is described in terms of the known, which, by the way, is no better 'understood.' It is obvious that in these senses explanation only differs from description in degree of simplicity and economy. But we pass to a quite different use of the term when we define explanation to mean 'reference to a cause.' The explanation of a thing in this case says more than *that* it is or *what* it is; it states *why* it is, or rather why it *must be*. Such explanation is far more than 'simplest possible description'; it satisfies our need of causality, which no mere description, however perfect or simple, can ever do. It would be well if the term might be restricted to this meaning, for here we first come upon a real difference from mere description, and the distinction is broad and important. It is explanation in this sense that Science now proposes to disclaim and admits to be out of its province. And this is why the acknowledgement is of epistemological importance. It consists in the elimination of the category of Cause, and involves, as has been already pointed out, renunciation on the part of Science of all claim to the title of Natural Philosophy, of all power to bar the way of Natural Theology. It is the deliberate falling back upon the more modest character of a highly elaborated and ingeniously articulated system of shorthand or pictorial natural history.

---

[1] As with Jevons, &c.

Science thus reformed by extrication from metaphysical entanglements, and still more when purged of presuppositions and theoretical inconsistencies to which allusion has yet to be made, can no longer be held to supply a solid basis of accurate positive knowledge for the superstructure of naturalistic generalisation. When this shall have been realised it may be sanguinely expected that Naturalism will have lost much of its charm and plausibility for students of Natural Science. The question will then arise afresh for them, 'Is any Metaphysics necessary or possible?' Science being no longer a substitute for Metaphysics, two alternatives will remain. Either there can be a return towards Ontology and Theology, so far at least as to give them that consideration on their own merits which has often been grudged them since Mill's *Logic* came to be considered sufficient philosophical furniture for the scientific mind; or there may be an attempt to remain content with what, in the present state of the Epistemology of Science, are often regarded as the bare 'certainties of experience,' with the nominalistic Empiricism which is all that is left when the old philosophy of 'phaenomena-per-se' has passed through the sieve of the newer Science. But it can hardly be expected that many will rest satisfied with a conceptual *résumé* of observed sequences and coexistences of phaenomena such as can assign them no meaning and interpretation. Man will irresistibly aspire to be more than a cataloguer of meaningless 'groups of sense-impressions' by means of a purely quantitative system which ignores the larger part of the content of the sense-impressions themselves. He will strive after a philosophy, though it may never be granted to him to attain to a complete one. The enthusiastic representative of 'deanthropomorphised' Science who would restrict all thought within its ideal formulae, even should he see the pile of its systematised phaenomena complete, will still find no purpose for their purposefulness, no reason for their rationality. He who would endeavour to *understand* them, he who would strive for a solution of the World-problem, will doubtless transgress the bounds of demonstrable knowledge; but after all 'probability is the guide of life,' and the adoption, as a belief, of a probable interpretation suggested by the facts themselves, when studied in their entirety, will surely seem more rational than contentment with a pure and abstract certainty, as meaningless as it is valid, about one knows not what. We may perhaps venture, then, to anticipate a revival of interest in first principles and extra-scientific problems as a result of the tendency to sever Science from Philosophy.

Meanwhile other consequences will flow from this important separation. One of these is that we may soon hope to hear the last of the historic 'conflict' between *Science* and Theology. If Science is to be henceforth only a co-ordination of facts, a description of the order of their coexistence and succession, and is not at all to be concerned with the general interpretation of them by offering its working-hypotheses for metaphysical principles, it can obviously only come into contact and conflict with Theology on the ground of specific matters of fact. That it has done so in the past with no hurt, but with real gain, to Theology, is a fact of which no one needs to be reminded. That Theology has laid claim in the past to full and final knowledge on matters of which we now see that she could not possess knowledge at all, must be acknowledged. In this respect she has erred even more grievously, perhaps, than the natural sciences, and has thereby proclaimed, like them, the need of a thorough epistemological examination of her first principles, of the origin, nature and limits of her knowledge; a 'critical regress,' which for the most part has yet to be undertaken. The word 'conflict,' then, has been applied aptly enough to some of the past relations of Theology with natural knowledge. But such conflict will soon have become impossible for the future. With regard to the origin of the world, of species, of man, the struggle is over, and we now see that its occurrence was due to the inevitably gradual advance of theological theory and its partial dependence upon the progress of Science. When the sole remaining subject for this kind of dispute, that of the Fall of Man, shall have been handed over as far as may be by Theology to Anthropology, as the problems just mentioned have been handed over to other special sciences, there will apparently remain no further scope for collision between Science, strictly so called, and Theology. For the force of the following words of St Augustine, not always grasped perhaps by himself[1], and for centuries unrecognised, nowadays comes home to almost every one[2].

'Plerumque enim accidit ut aliquid de terra, de caelo, de caeteris mundi huius elementis, de motu et conversione vel etiam magnitudine et intervallis siderum, de certis defectibus solis ac lunae, de circuitibus annorum et temporum, de naturis animalium, fruticum, lapidum, atque huiusmodi caeteris, etiam non Christianus ita noverit, ut certissima ratione vel experientia teneat. Turpe est autem nimis et perniciosum ac maxime cavendum, ut Christianum, de his rebus quasi secundum Christianas Litteras loquentem, ita delirare quilibet infidelis audiat, ut, quemadmodum dicitur, toto caelo errare conspiciens, risum tenere vix possit.'

The controversy between Theology and Science, in the new sense of the latter term, may be regarded, we have said, as almost a thing of the past. Doubtless there will still be found representatives of Science who, unacquainted with changes in theological thought and methods, will mistake Christianity for a 'religion of a book'; and possibly individual champions will from time to time attempt to defend discarded theological prepossessions; but the controversy is never likely to be seriously revived. The student who would henceforth seek to mediate between the two must betake himself to their common ground of Philosophy.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to point out that the process of elimination of the concepts of God, end, substance, efficient cause (force) from Science, gradually but now finally completed, does not imply that they are eliminated from Metaphysics, or from experience. They are metaphysical, not scientific, terms; and their banishment from Science only means that Science is freeing itself from Metaphysics. That the idea of God is not necessary to Science is no argument against His existence, or against the necessity of the concept to Philosophy[3]. The business of Science is the mere description, in terms of mass and motion, of the quantitative relations of things; its premisses do not include the supernatural, and it is obviously *indifferent* to theistic hypotheses rather than exclusive of them. The work of Philosophy, on the other hand, is the systematisation and interpretation of the subject-matter of the special sciences. It seeks to introduce those aspects of reality—efficiency, purpose, meaning, worth—with which Science, by reason of its abstract nature, is not concerned, and for which it does not, and cannot, find a place. But because these things are not found in experience by Science, it does not follow that they are not there. 'Reality is richer than thought,' as Lotze was fond of saying; and after all the mechanical description of Nature is but a partial one at best. Even if adequate for descriptive purposes, which, as we shall see, it is not, it would not reduce Nature to a machine and nothing more. It is often objected to teleological arguments that the fact that the results of adaptation in organic nature can be described as teleological is no proof in itself of the existence there of purpose. It is true; and it is equally true that from the fact that Nature so far admits of description in terms of the mechanical theory as to enable us to predict the order of her phaenomena, it does not follow that Nature *is* 'objectified logic' or mere mechanism.

---

[1] As is implied in his argument against the existence of antipodes. *De Civ. Dei* lib. xvi cap. 9.

[2] *De Genesi ad Litt.*, lib. i cap. xix § 39. I am indebted to Dr. Cunningham's *St. Austin* for reference to this passage.

[3] We are sometimes reminded of Occam's razor, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda*

We may now sum up the consequences of the growing recognition of the abstract nature of Science, and its severance from Metaphysics, in so far as they concern Theology. In the first place Science is practically debarred for the future from 'conflict' with Theology; it will henceforth be only with Natural Philosophy that Theology will have to deal. Secondly, the hypothetical mechanism of Science which Naturalism objectified into the actual structure of the world, thereby excluding teleology and spirit, is reduced to a pictorial representation of one comparatively unimportant aspect of the world; the naturalistic theory therefore falls, and along with it the chief argument against teleology. Thirdly, the positivist theory of knowledge, on the strength of which Ontology and Rational Theology are repudiated, loses its foundation. Lastly, the naturalistic claim

---

praeter necessitatem, as if it were relevant in this connexion. To think so implies the old confusion of Science with Metaphysics.

to have dispensed with Theism, because it is not implicated in the special sciences, is seen to be irrelevant.

III. There are other currents observable in scientific literature, of which the theological apologist may take note. One cannot fail to notice a growing discontentment amongst physicists with the mechanical theory, even as a purely scientific working-hypothesis, both from its inadequacy as a whole and the inconsistencies of its various parts. This dissatisfaction is chiefly due to the fact that scientific experts are realizing that epistemological questions underlie the problems of the special sciences. It is, perhaps, not too much to believe that there are signs of a metaphysical renaissance in the scientific world, towards which one looks with interest and hope. Again, the drifting away of physiologists from the dogmatic Materialism of half a century ago in the direction of Spiritualism is proceeding, and likely to proceed. A further revolutionary impetus in the same direction is likely to be derived from the developement of Psychology—I do not mean of the 'modern' or physiological kind. Should that science in the coming century achieve a progress comparable to that which any of the physical sciences has been making, it would be quite impossible to foretell what might be its effect upon current thought in a direction opposite to that which has predominated in this 'century of Natural Science.'

(1) There is not much evidence, on the surface at least, of anything approaching to a philosophical renaissance amongst living representatives of British Science, even on its biological side. I have mentioned, in the course of this paper, one or two physicists[1] who have shared in the movement led by Prof. Mach; with these exceptions there seems to prevail in their circle a secure unconsciousness of the need of critical investigations. This may partly be due to the very inadequate treatment, from the one or two scientific writers who reviewed it, of a book which ought long ago to have produced grave searchings of mind far and wide among the teachers and framers of scientific theory[2]. In America one notices a rising interest amongst scientific

---

[1] Profs. K. Pearson and Poynting (see below). The names of Prof. O. Lodge and Mr. Muirhead might be added to the list of the 'dissatisfied.'

[2] I allude to Stallo's *Concepts of Modern Physics*, a work of great learning and ability, in which grave inconsistencies in traditional physical theories are forcibly pointed out.

writers in the philosophical side of their special departments[1]. On the continent, however, the restlessness is very evident, and far-reaching changes are under discussion[2]. So much so that Prof. Boltzmann[3] could write some time ago, 'An almost exaggerated criticism of the methods of scientific investigation is indeed a characteristic of the present day.'

One very interesting result of this activity of thought is the discovery that the mechanical theory, which has almost from its birth been universally regarded by Science as the only possible theory by which Nature could be made intelligible, is, so to speak, of purely accidental origin, and not a matter of *a priori* necessity. Just as Science itself arose out of the necessities of practical life, so the mechanical theory arose from the fact that motion is the form of change, and impact the form of action which, from the nature of our constitution, we can most easily conceive; they are the simplest phaenomena and '. . . dem Verständniss am nächsten liegen,' as Kirchhoff said. That we *must* explain all physical events mechanically is therefore a prejudice. The laws of motion and the hypotheses of Physics were invented for particular and special problems, and it is merely arbitrary to suppose that they are likely to prove applicable to all the subject-matter of knowledge. Were it not that our senses of sight and touch happen to be the most highly developed, we should have adopted another descriptive apparatus than the mechanical[4], which was demanded by the nature of our sense-faculties rather than by the process of Nature. Subjective necessity was the mother of its invention; it is an instance of man's unbounded anthropomorphism. The doctrine of Evolution and the growth of the young science of Anthropology have led to the detection of anthropocentric prejudices in physical theory; and mental equipments taken to be inherently essential are found like other things to have had a 'flowing past,' and to be destined to dissolution in the course of a 'flowing' future. The mechanical theory, in fact, is no longer the sole possible outlook reached once and for all; it is no longer held absurd to speculate about its replacement by a better[1]. Another foundation for physical science than that based upon the laws of Newton, more free from presuppositions and inconsistencies, is in the air[2].

---

[1] See, e. g., the works of Pierce and Halsted in Mathematics; perhaps Dolbear in Physics; Brooks, Le Conte, Osborn, &c., in Biology. I am informed by Prof. Wenley, of Michigan, that a similar tendency exists in other American scientific authors with whose works I am unacquainted, e. g. Hofmann and Wilson. Some articles in *The Monist* would also serve for illustration.

[2] Profs. E. Mach, Axel Harnack, Duhem, and Ostwald may be mentioned as representatives.

[3] *Philosophical Magazine*, 36, p. 37.

[4] Cf. Prof. Poynting's *Address to the Math. and Phys. section of the Brit. Assoc.*, 1899. Prof. Poynting, from whom I have received several interesting pamphlets in which he has discussed this and kindred subjects, is one of the few English physicists who are known to be in sympathy with much of the teaching of the Kirchhoff school.

The discussion of the special failures and inconsistencies in the present state of physical (mechanical) theory would involve the introduction of technical scientific details which would here be out of place. It must suffice to state the reality of the discovery of these deficiencies[3]. The following confession of them by a zealously anti-metaphysical representative of Science is of perhaps more than ordinary interest to the theologian[4]:

> 'The obscurity which envelopes the *principia* of science is not only due to an historical evolution marked by the authority of great names, but to the fact that science, so long as it had to carry on a difficult warfare with metaphysics and dogma, like a skilful general conceived it best to hide its own deficient organisation. There can be small doubt, however, that this deficient organisation will not only in time be perceived by the enemy, but that it has already had a very discouraging influence both on scientific recruits and on intelligent laymen.'

---

[1] Cf. Kirchhoff, *op. cit.* Vorlesung, i § 1, 'Es ist von vorn herein sehr wohl denkbar, dass Zweifel darüber bestehen können, ob eine oder eine andere Beschreibung gewisser Erscheinungen die einfachere ist; es ist auch denkbar, dass eine Beschreibung gewisser Erscheinungen, die heute unzweifelhaft die einfachste ist, die man geben kann, später, bei weiterer Entwickelung der Wissenschaft, durch eine noch einfachere ersetzt wird. Dass Aehnliches stattgefunden hat, dafür bietet die Mechanik mannigfaltige Beispiele dar.'

[2] For the recent attempt to replace the mechanical basis of Physics by the science of Energetics, to substitute energy as the ultimate concept of Physics in the place of mass and motion, see Ostwald, *op. cit.*, Ward, *op. cit.*, i ch. vi. Several physicists have advocated a return from the hypothesis of contact-action to that of action at a distance, e. g. Stallo, P. du Bois-Reymond.

[3] For their discussion see Stallo, Ward, Ostwald, Duhem, and the further references given in their works already quoted; also the recently published *Philosophy of Atomic Theories* by Prof. Hannequin of Lyon.

[4] Karl Pearson, *Grammar of Science*, p. viii. Since this paper went to press a second edition of this work has appeared.

Whether the confusions here referred to are merely matters of 'organisation' must be left to individual minds to estimate; in any case it will be well for the theologian concerned with the demolition of Naturalism to be acquainted with them, for they are of its very essence. And if the Mechanical theory, which has almost appropriated to itself the name of Science, be really what we have here represented it to be, not science at all but bad metaphysics, a collection of hypotheses and mental symbols concreted into rigid laws and actual entities; if it be so far from the final or sole possible interpretation, or even description, of the world as to be even now, for its inconsistencies and shortcomings, threatened with rejection, then an obstacle greater than any which in modern times has beset the progress of Christian Theology amongst cultured men will ere long have disappeared.

(2) The abandonment by scientific writers of dogmatic Materialism has not hitherto been made avowedly in the interests of Spiritualism, but has been rather due to the influence of the Agnosticism which has made any form of Metaphysics unfashionable with students of Science. Consciously or unconsciously, compulsorily or spontaneously, however, the tendency is in the spiritualistic direction. The Materialism of forty years ago, of Moleschott, Büchner, Vogt and Czolbe, due to the rapid advance of Physiology, has now for some time been discarded in biological literature. Haeckel and his followers have abandoned it for a Monism of which we had a much more philosophically competent representative in Romanes. This Monism is apparently a halfway house on the road to Spiritualism. Though generally agnostic in profession and materialistic in terminology and bias, it often contains lurking spiritualistic implications. Prof. Ward has lately called attention to the admissions of Prof. Huxley, and demonstrated that they lead straight and inevitably to the spiritualistic standpoint. Huxley, perhaps the ablest philosopher that modern Science has reared, is indeed an interesting type and summary of the whole tendency of the biological philosophy of a vacillating and tentative period. In spite of his professed agnostic attitude towards metaphysical problems, and his vigorous defence of what may be called *regulative* or methodological Materialism, he seems to have been unconsciously committed to the premisses of Spiritualism.

It is curious to notice further that the basis of such materialistic elements as remain in the Monism now popular with biologists, is the metaphysical Mechanics which physicists are beginning to repudiate. When the reformation which we have seen to be proceeding in Physics shall have begun to attract the observation of physiologists, it would seem that the retreat from Monism to Materialism will be cut off for ever. Should agnostic Monism prove to be only the temporary and unstable product of the striving between inherited materialistic bias and growing sensibleness of materialistic fallacies, the only direction in which it will be able to lapse will be that of Spiritualism. The victory gained in Physics by dynamical over mechanical theory already makes this move more possible, and we may hope to see the long supremacy of matter over mind inverted.

(3) This hope is confirmed when we reflect further that Natural Philosophy has yet to reckon with the psychological aspect of experience which, for the pursuit of its own work, it has been compelled to neglect. Perhaps the most striking and original part of Prof. Ward's important contribution to the philosophy of Science is that in which, after demolishing Naturalism as it stands, he proceeds to lay bare, with the masterly precision of an expert in Psychology, the stages by which the whole system has grown up. The errors of Naturalism are due to its uncritical acceptance of the naïve dualism of 'common sense,' and this dualism in turn results from the separate treatment, by Psychology and the Natural Sciences respectively, of the experience of the individual and the universal Experience which is the result of inter-subjective intercourse. But 'the world cannot be severed from the minds that perceive it, and yet remain phaenomenal; neither can it be completely and adequately explained or described in materialistic terminology [1].' 'The assumed primacy of the physical as against the psychical is due, first, to the fact that in his absorption and interest in the objective attitude, the naturalist has forgotten *himself*; and next, to the fact that he has mistaken his abstract conceptions for presented realities [2].' The naturalistic Philosophy fails, in fact, because of its severance of the objective side of experience from the subjective, its divorce of nature from mind, its pro-

---

[1] *Gifford Lectures*, vol. ii p. 105.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 106.

ceeding as if the half were the whole. Physicists of the school of Mach have already arrived at the discovery of the monistic nature of experience, the 'duality in unity' of subject and object. But the shadow of the traditional Psychology of Naturalism, a crude Empiricism, still hangs over them, and the full consequences of their attempt to force back Science to the point where it parted company with Psychology are yet hidden from them. They will probably not be hidden long, however. Epistemology is becoming busy, and Psychology may be expected to soon assert more loudly its claim to assist in the erection of Natural Philosophy. The first great contribution to that work which has come from the psychological side since Lotze (I refer of course to Dr. Ward's *Gifford Lectures* for 1896–98) is significant and suggestive in this respect. The seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries have unmistakably stamped their Philosophy with the marks of Mathematics, Physical and Biological Science respectively. It will be at least timely that the philosophy of the twentieth century should receive a predominantly psychological impress. That the spiritualistic trend of Natural Philosophy, of which there are already signs, would be then accentuated, one can hardly believe to admit of doubt.

It will scarcely be necessary at the end of this paper, already carried to immoderate length, to indicate more fully than has here and there been hinted, the significance for Theology of the tendencies of thought with which it has endeavoured to deal. They will doubtless be sufficiently obvious. It need only be added that movements converging from several sides, and largely from within Science itself, point to an inevitable tendency of Natural Philosophy in a spiritualistic direction. It is a step certainly, but still a comparatively easy step, from Spiritualism to Theism. The movements here described have therefore a deeper significance than the removal of materialistic or naturalistic views long potent as obstacles of Theology, though there would be much to be thankful for in that. They suggest and point to a reconstruction of Natural Philosophy on spiritualistic lines, such as perhaps will permanently affect its relations and attitude to Natural and Rational Theology.

F. R. TENNANT.

DR. HORT'S LIFE AND WORKS.

In the year 1857 an article appeared in the *Westminster Review*, from the pen of the late Mr. Mark Pattison, on 'Theology in Germany.' The writer spoke severely, indeed contemptuously, of the then condition of the study of Theology in England; Dr. Pusey, the author's former leader, is personally assailed, and it is implied that there is no reasonable and intelligent interest in the subject in England, but that in Germany alone Theology is freely and scientifically studied. An account is given of the various schools of theological thought then prevailing in this most favoured nation, and an estimate is made of their various characteristics. The one to which of all others the term scientific is said to belong rightly is the school of Tübingen, under the leadership of F. C. Baur. To this school, Mr. Pattison tells us, has fallen the noble task of continuing the work of the Reformation. Baur and those who work with him, or on his lines, have to determine the meaning and force of the claim of Scripture, upon which the Reformers had taken their stand; to separate the true from the false in the traditional lists of Church writings, and to reproduce by simple and unbiassed attention to proved fact the real history of the origin and early developments of Christianity. It is therefore to Baur—'unquestionably the first of living theologians'—that Mr. Pattison, in 1857, exhorted his readers to look for real theological advance. Though he criticizes his hero with great candour and discrimination, yet he regards him as the representative of a true and valid historical method: and therefore he can only despair.

It is probable that, owing to the despairing view which Pattison took of the prospects of learning in England, and the comparatively impressive effect of German scholarship, he overlooked the University of Cambridge. And yet at the very time that he was writing, the questions raised by the Tübingen school of theologians were already being dealt with in a fashion characteristic both of the English mind and especially of the traditions of Cambridge scholarship. Already by the year 1857 Dr. Westcott had produced his *Elements of a Gospel Harmony* and the first edition of his work on the Canon of the New Testament. Already the edition of the text of the New Testament had been projected by Dr. Westcott and his friend Dr. Hort. And though Dr. Hort himself had published nothing directly referring to the Tübingen discussions, yet the Preface to the first edition of the History of the Canon, read in the light of the correspondence in Dr. Hort's *Life*, shows plainly the spirit in which the questions were being approached at Cambridge. Dr. Westcott claims to have dealt 'with the New Testament as a whole, and that on purely historical grounds.'

This phrase might stand as a motto for the main part of the work which Dr. Hort has left behind him. He dealt with the New Testament as a whole, and on purely historical grounds. He was a man who combined, in a rare degree, width and depth of knowledge. Though he spread out his energies over an extraordinarily wide field, he is never superficial, never contents himself with the first glance or first impression, but always penetrates to the heart of the matter before him, so far as his materials enable him to go. And as his learning was thus singularly wide and exhaustive, so he contemplated giving it expression in a remarkable variety of shapes. The larger number of these schemes were never carried out; they appear and disappear in his correspondence: Natural Science, Philosophy, Classical Scholarship gradually give way before the overmastering claims of theological learning; and it remains that all the printed work that has yet appeared under his name (with the exception of a few essays and articles) is connected more or less closely with the New Testament, or with the history of the Church. It will be, therefore, on this work mainly that those will rest their opinion who lived outside the range of his personal influence. But the Letters will make it plain even to these what a privilege it must have been to know Dr. Hort and be guided by his learning. Whatever special interests people had they were sure to find some echo in Dr. Hort: he would be sure to see their position in an original and characteristic way, and throw new light upon it from the wealth of his knowledge. Though the works on philosophy and natural science of which he dreamed never saw the light, yet the learning which was to express itself in them was not wasted. It contributed to the unique position which Dr. Hort occupied, and accounts for the profound veneration which the best of his contemporaries always felt for his judgement. Thus while Pattison was despairing, Hort and his Cambridge friends were setting to work: and it is of Hort's contributions to this work that we have now to speak—so far as may be allowed to one who writes from the point of view of tolerably 'intelligent ignorance.'

It is natural, in endeavouring to form some general estimate of the achievement of any great man, to inquire what his education was, and for what he was fitted by it. The question is a simple one in Dr. Hort's case. He was at Rugby under Arnold first, and then under Tait; and already at school began to display the universal desire for knowledge which was so characteristic of him in later life. Classics were, of course, his main pursuit: but he occupied himself with botany and any other form of scientific knowledge that came in his way. But it was at school that he decided to seek Holy Orders, and it was at school, under Bonamy Price's directions, that the foundation was laid of his love for textual criticism and New Testament scholarship. In like manner at Cambridge he followed no narrow or limited course. In those days it was necessary to attain honours in Mathematics as a condition of entering for the Classical Tripos. But Dr. Hort did not confine himself even to this sufficiently extensive course, but when he had finished and taken his degree in these two subjects, he entered again the examination-room in Natural Science and Moral Philosophy.

There was some danger, no doubt, that so extended a range might have implied some superficiality of treatment. It seems almost incredible that any one mind can have worked over so much ground with any real completeness. And, indeed, there are signs in later days that Dr. Hort's friends feared the effect of his width of interest upon his powers of concentration. Thus Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott seem to have expressed some alarm at the energy with which he was studying the Geology of the Cheltenham district, and to have hinted at a closer pursuit of the

Commentary on St. James. But it should be noted that this was not because they feared his losing thoroughness, but because they knew so well his determination to be thorough even in the outlying subjects of his interest, that they felt obliged to protest in the interest of his New Testament work. In spite, therefore, of the wide variety of his studies, Dr. Hort clearly did not fall into the besetting danger of such a mind, but contrived to retain over the whole field the same characteristic thoroughness of which the Introduction to the Text of the New Testament is so conspicuous an instance. So far as may be gathered from the *Life*, this unusual success seems to be due partly to a great seriousness of temper, and partly, of course, to the special conditions of the education at Rugby and at Cambridge. The teacher's task is half done if he has to deal with a mind in which there is a real reverence for truth and a real passion for accuracy. Men often talk as if this were to be assumed as the natural property of every rational being: as if there were no real division among men based upon the presence or absence of this quality. As a matter of fact, as any teacher can tell with very short experience, a real and serious desire to know, a real reverence for a fact as such, quite apart from its commercial or controversial value, is a comparatively rare gift. Many people have intelligent interests, but those who have nothing more will not take the trouble to acquire real and deep knowledge. They will be contented with the aspect of things that strikes their attention first, and will not care to inquire how far the first impression truly and exhaustively corresponds with fact. To possess the true desire for knowledge constitutes a fundamental division between man and man, and it was one of the most significant of Dr. Hort's endowments.

The best powers, however, need training, and it is important to notice some of the salient features of the education at Rugby and at Cambridge. It is clear that to be at Rugby in Arnold's day was to be in the very front of educational progress. And this meant that, together with many other changes, Arnold put real intellectual learning into a new position. Even in the bad days for public schools, Eton and Westminster, in spite of their hopelessly antiquated methods, continued to supply men 'qualified for the service of God in Church and State.' Somehow men contrived to get themselves educated there in no mean fashion. But the result of the school life was irregular and uncertain, and it is not easy to see traces of a real enthusiasm for intellectual truth. But Arnold, while he breathed a new spirit into the social and moral side of public-school life, did not fail also to develop a true desire for knowledge. He, and those whom he influenced, put learning into a new position: he made it a thing of life and interest, instead of a task unaccountably imposed. For a person with endowments like Hort's to come in contact with teaching like that of Arnold and his colleagues was to have an original tendency of mind turned into a vital practical principle.

School life, however, even under an Arnold or a Tait, is necessarily restricted in area. It is the University which affords the fullest opportunities of research in the various fields of knowledge. We have already indicated the fields in which Hort obtained distinction: we must now endeavour to point out their fitness for developing the innate character of his mind. If we have been right so far in our conception of his mental progress, it would seem that the special value of these studies to him was their *scientific* character. They led to wide and general views of things through the medium of hard facts. The rule which compelled classical men to enter for the Mathematical Tripos was to Hort's mind an infinite advantage to classics (*Life* vol. i p. 109), and he was careful to spend his full powers upon these subjects considered 'as a discipline of the mind.' The classical course, so far as can be gathered from the allusions to it in the Correspondence, consisted of a careful study of certain books, which did not, however, imply an exemption from the duty of wide and exhaustive study of literature. Even the Moral Philosophy Tripos, so far as the list of papers enables us to judge, was less concerned with the actual discussion of problems than with the history of them. Thus his education was severely concrete, dealing with facts rather than theories: and it seems to have produced in his mind a definite ideal of knowledge. Before he took his degree he 'takes his stand on Bacon's glorious words, "Nos . . . templum sanctum ad exemplar mundi in intellectu humano fundamus. Itaque exemplar sequimur. Nam quicquid essentia dignum est, id etiam scientia dignum; quae est essentiae imago."' This standpoint gives a kind of sacredness to truth as such, to the knowledge of any fact, and it is with this conviction that Hort sets out upon the life of a scholar. Truth, and that the full truth, is the object which he puts before him as his ideal; but yet this is not an abstract subject of mere speculation, but a vital force. The Fellowship at Trinity is 'not so much an honour as an acquisition of a vantage-ground from which whatever message may be committed to us is likely to be listened to with the more attention' (*Life* vol. i p. 230).

We have dwelt at some length upon these earlier facts of Dr. Hort's life because they seem to be typical of the whole history of the man. From beginning to end of his life Dr. Hort was a devoted follower of truth, and he sought truth always in the same way—i. e. by an exhaustive collection of facts which he bound together and co-ordinated by means of a singularly acute theoretic power. It is clear that this is a thoroughly scientific ideal of work, as science is ordinarily understood. Science aims at reducing to the minimum the subjectivity of the worker. Facts are allowed, as far as possible, to produce their effect simply by being recognized as facts. They are not, of course, simply amassed and left to arrange themselves: their affinities, similarities, and recurrences are all carefully noted; and a scheme is built out of them, of which the value will depend upon the accuracy and completeness of the observation used to produce it, and not upon any acuteness of anticipation of nature's processes. Of course, such a method does not proceed without the free use of the power of scientific imagination. A person who merely amassed facts without this would be wholly incapable of finding any use for them. And Hort was a conspicuous instance of an observer who was fully gifted also with the power of co-ordination. Thus Dr. Scrivener, whose views upon New Testament criticism were very widely different from Dr. Hort's, writes as follows on the *Dissertations* (*Life* vol. ii p. 177): 'You possess a gift of elaborating from your own consciousness theories which are never groundless, never visionary, beyond any man I ever had the happiness to meet with.' In spite of his laborious carefulness in investigation he never lost sight of the whole, or persuaded himself that an ascertained fact needs no interpretation.

We have already mentioned that Dr. Hort failed to produce the work upon Philosophy which he projected. There are indications, to which we may have occasion to allude further, of his attitude towards some philosophical questions. But the main source of knowledge as to the general character of his philosophical outlook is the volume of Hulsean Lectures, *The Way, The Truth, The Life*: and we propose to take this work for our first illustration of the scientific method pursued by Dr. Hort in all his investigations.

The lectures are, in the first place, completely different in style from any ordinary philosophical work. They are in the strictest sense an exposition of a particular text, St. John xiv 5, 6; that is, the text is not used as a mere motto to express, summarily and in scriptural language, teaching of the author's own: whatever teaching comes from it is based upon an elaborately careful statement of the historical conditions and primary meaning of the words. Dr. Hort shows the meaning which the question of St. Thomas must have carried to his mind, and the great extension of his thought which the answer required. He shows how the history of the Church from the first to the last is the continual expansion and articulation of the exact meaning of Christ's words. When He says, 'I am the Way,' He does not mean merely, I will be your Guide, or your Example, but He means just what He says. The words 'convey a doctrine of Creation and Providence, not merely of historical mission; a claim on the part of the speaker to permanent supremacy in the whole manifold economy of circumstance. They are the practical and ethical expression of an all-embracing truth which we may perhaps apprehend best in the form of two separate doctrines; first, that the whole seeming maze of history in nature and man, the tumultuous movement of the world in progress, has running through it one supreme dominating Way; and second, that He who on earth was called Jesus the Nazarene *is* that Way' (pp. 20, 21). So again Christ *is* the Truth and the Life. 'The place which Christ holds in the movement of events as the Way implies, if we may venture to use such language, that He holds a corresponding place as the Truth in the permanent order of all things that exist. The Way lies most on the surface as presented to our faculties: further down lies the Truth, and beneath the Truth the Life. It is because the eternal Son of God is the Life that He is the Truth; and it is because He is the Truth that He is the Way' (pp. 55, 56).

These main positions are simply exegetical: as they stand, they state the bare meaning of the words addressed by our Lord to St. Thomas. But as we read the book we find that just because they are accepted thus literally, they prove to be philosophical principles. Philosophy aims at finding some universal formula which will make possible the complete explanation of the facts and history of the world. In this work Dr. Hort declares his conviction that in the apprehension of Christ by the true disciple the problems of human life are solved.

But it will be said that such principles as these are valueless because they are so remote. They do not reach the actual surface of ordinary life; they float loftily above it in a higher region. This is, without doubt, a difficulty to all thinkers of the type of Dr. Hort. We think that he would probably answer it in two ways. In the first place, he would maintain that it arises from the conviction that the knowledge and the interests of this world are in the highest and fullest sense real and final: and this he would deny (cf. p. 82). Secondly, he would appeal to the history of the Church as showing in experience how the main spiritual principle, that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is interpreted in practical life. A belief in the all-sufficiency of the knowledge bounded by the senses of course excludes any knowledge of God: but then it fails in the end as knowledge. 'The pursuit and hope of knowledge [in the Greek world] had wasted to a phantom, because it could not be at once comprehensive and consistent unless God had a place in it; and the hereditary religion gave no footing for a Divine Knowledge to be the crown of all other knowledge' (p. 64). So far knowledge had failed. 'No further progress in knowledge of truth, beyond what had been already gained and lost, was possible till [the Resurrection] that contradiction of average sensible experience was freely admitted' (p. 66). This was the point of St. Paul's preaching at Athens. Here, therefore, was a case in which Christ was declaring Himself as the Truth, and thereby giving new force, new dignity, and new reality to the whole conception of knowledge.

As the Way Christ dominates action, as the Truth He dominates knowledge; but there is yet a third stage; there is Life. 'Man and the universe surrounding man can by no means be resolved completely into a succession of acts and events and a constitutive order of permanent forms. The one most mysterious but most mighty factor of created things remains . . . even that which, generalizing rudely from a single conspicuous manifestation, we call life. . . . This life as it is in man . . . not only is the necessary latent base of human action and knowledge, but by their side and in their midst has its own proper manifestations in what is called in the widest sense emotion. Life is more than emotion, but the special expression of life is emotion' (p. 120), and Christ is the Life. This truth—which is in some ways the most difficult of all to express in words—is illustrated in the subsequent parts of the Last Discourses, and in the experience of the Church. As love is 'the highest manifestation of life,' so in the love of Christ and His Church the truth that He is the Life is most conspicuously set forth. It finds expression also in the triumph over death which the early experiences of the Church so painfully verified. It takes effect in the union, the love, the obedience, and the joy of all Christ's followers, and rests 'on the union and communion of the Father and the Son' (p. 125).

These three statements, thus interpreted, are in themselves a philosophy of life. But it must be admitted that they do not look like it. Philosophy, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, begins at the other end to this. It asks the question, What is real? or, How can we be sure that our senses tell us the truth? The final formulae into which all experience is ultimately to be swept are expected to rise out of these discussions. Dr. Hort's method is exactly the opposite. He does not aim, so far as this book would suggest, at a constructive system of metaphysics. Christianity, he knows, claims to be the final account of man's life and hopes. He therefore goes to the books in which Christianity finds its inspiration, seizes upon a critical declaration by the Founder of His claims: and then simply asks what these mean, how their exact historical interpretation suggests a significance that is for all time. In many ways he leaves himself open to assault. Some will say the authenticity of the record is not proved: others, that the critical fact, the Resurrection, is neither proved nor probable, and that it is an error to assume these even provisionally. Upon these points, no doubt, he would have been prepared to expatiate at another time. But in spite of these omissions, as some will think them, what he has attempted is to have interpreted Christianity as it stands in the Gospels in a universal sense, to have shown—to use his own words—that 'the Gospel in all its parts and all its forms makes provision for the infinite future by giving answer to finite questions already asked' (p. 3). Christianity is not to be a separate study, beginning when philosophy has completed its work: it rather includes and transcends from the first all philosophy, and answers the questions which philosophy by itself can only ask. And this being so, the main source of the philosophy which rises out of Christianity is to be sought in an exact statement of the actual claims of Christ.

A like combination of characteristics is to be found in the critical work left by Dr. Hort. The textual theory embodied in the *Introduction* is a remarkable union of minute and laborious examination of facts, with a bold and skilful interpretation of them. Dean Burgon wrote as though the theory were merely a web spun by the imagination of Dr. Hort and having the most feeble contact with fact. Nothing could have been less apposite. It is true that one of the main contentions of the *Introduction* was present to the minds of the two critics quite early in the history of their undertaking. In 1853 Hort writes to the Rev. J. Ellerton that 'he (Westcott) and I are going to edit a Greek text of the New Testament some two or three years hence, if possible. . . . Our object is to supply clergymen, schools, &c., with a portable Greek Testament which shall not be disfigured with Byzantine corruptions' (*Life* vol. i p. 250); and this passage looks as if a reading traceable to Constantinople had already begun to look suspicious. But the views finally adopted in the *Introduction* were not defined first and then imposed on the text: they were the gradual result of the exhaustive comparison and co-ordination of all the facts supplied by the MSS. No reading, however apparently unimportant, was thrown aside until it had given up under examination any indirect evidence of which it might be capable. Thus in 1862 he writes to his collaborator: 'For a great mass of the readings, if we separate them in thought from the rest, the labour is wholly disproportionate. But believing it to be absolutely impossible to draw a line between important and unimportant readings, I should hesitate to say that the entire labour is disproportionate to the worth of fixing the entire text to the utmost extent now practicable. . . . Every right-minded person, I suppose, has a relative contempt for orthographic details. Their dignity comes from their being essential to complete treatment. And I confess, when once at work upon them, I find a certain tepid interest as in any research depending on evidence and involving laws' (*Life* vol. i p. 455, cf. p. 425). Such a passage as this implies that, however freely the authors interpreted the facts under their examination, they regulated their movements by a precise and exhaustive inquiry into the actual character of their facts. Their work differs from the work of others primarily in the number and variety of facts taken into account: if it differs also in the comprehensiveness of the theory expounded, that is not because they are more reckless or more imaginative than other critics, but because they have gone further towards a complete survey of what is a strictly finite class of facts, with a limited range of possibilities in the way of explanation.

The disposition thus to penetrate to the fundamental facts in any matter which he was investigating naturally gave an impression that he held slightly by tradition. This was certainly true, in the sense that he insisted on reopening questions which many persons regarded as closed, and it naturally resulted in a highly original mode of presentation. There is probably no part of his work, as it is represented in the printed volumes under his name (except perhaps the slighter series of popular Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers), which does not embody an original view of some question that is entirely his own. The Lectures on Judaistic Christianity, for instance, deal with a subject on part of which Lightfoot had had much to say. Hort does not enter into controversy with Lightfoot, nor does he exhaustively criticize him. He goes back upon the texts, and illustrates them from his knowledge of cognate literature, and in the end we find ourselves presented with an account of the Colossian heresy which differs widely from Lightfoot's, especially in the fact that it requires no factors outside Judaism to explain the rise of the particular type of doctrine. In like manner, the history of the Christian Ecclesia is set forth without any theoretical discussion of principles involved, but simply by means of a careful analysis of passages bearing on the subject. These works all suffer from the fact that they did not receive the final touches from the hand of their author. They are interesting and valuable specimens of his method, and there can be no doubt that they genuinely represent his mind: it is not possible to imagine that he would have given lectures with a less sense of responsibility than he would have felt for a printed book. At the same time, it is impossible not to regret that they did not receive his final polish and come out in his own lifetime. Even if, as is probable, the opinions remained the same, the fragmentary character which belongs to them would have been avoided, and the subjects would have been brought to the point indicated at the outset, with that completeness which was Dr. Hort's main characteristic.

Thus far we have endeavoured to let the life of Dr. Hort tell its own story within the limits of such an article as this. We have seen how the special character of Dr. Hort's mind, and the education under which it passed, took shape in a particular attitude towards truth and the process of inquiry into truth. We have seen that, though in no way afraid of the boldest theorizing, the main bent of Hort's mind was towards an unprejudiced and original inquiry into the facts. He utterly revolts at the very idea of being expected to prove a particular conclusion. Indeed, the unfounded fear that his two friends, Lightfoot and Westcott, were less independent than he, almost led to his withdrawal from the scheme of New Testament Commentaries (*Life* i 418–423). We have now to attempt the more difficult task of inquiring into the scientific value of this habit of mind, and considering to what degree, if any, it admits of modification, in what regions, if in any, it is liable to lead to error.

In the first place it should be noted that this ideal of scientific work comes as a heritage from Bacon and Newton. It is the modern expression of the Baconian principle, *natura parendo vincitur*. Bacon made it his aim—in the region of scientific method—to supersede the older plan of inquiring what nature might be expected to do, by the method of observation and experiment. Though his own applications of his method were not largely productive of positive truth, yet he is the true father of the modern advance in the knowledge of nature. Further, the whole succession of thinkers who, in definite terms or by implication, assume that the mind is passive in perception, count their descent from Bacon. And thus his influence reaches into the present day through Locke, Hume, and Mill. To all of these, truth lies in the observation of facts, and the construction of general laws by induction from the facts observed. They are shy of the recognition of any universal elements in the simpler activities of thought: the universal from their point of view is attained through the more particular. And in the still later developments of this point of view, evolution has been pressed into the service. Where earlier writers were in difficulty, in regard to the explanation of such commanding universality as that which belongs to mathematics, Mr. H. Spencer makes, at any rate, an apparent escape by extending the process of acquiring universal ideas over as many generations as may be necessary to produce it.

We have already dwelt on the fact that Dr. Hort never succeeded in getting the books written which he contemplated in the region of philosophy. But there are signs that his sympathies (whether carefully criticized or not there is not evidence to show) were with the point of view which traces back its lineage to Bacon. We have already noticed that he rests his view of the importance of small things in knowledge upon words of Bacon's. And we find later on that his sympathies are with Mill as against the Scottish school of metaphysicians (*Life* vol. ii p. 38); also that he thus characterizes the Bampton Lectures of the unfortunate Mansel: 'it is clear, vigorous, and not often unfair; only a big lie from beginning to end' *ibid.* vol. i p. 402). But more decisive indications are supplied by two passages dealing definitely with problems of existence. Thus he writes (*ibid.* vol. ii p. 101): 'I do not see how a relation can ultimately be interpreted as anything but the sense of a relation. We all, consciously or unconsciously, mean by existence the sense of appearance.' And again, on p. 283, apparently in connexion with some discussion on the Proof of the Existence of God, he writes: 'While it is impossible for me to think at all, except with reference to thinker and thought (about "existence" I say nothing), I cannot feel or understand any such necessity of (if the phrase may be forgiven) thinking God; belief in Him seems to me a secondary process, a result, capable of being either received or rejected.' Passages such as these seem to imply that the methods and philosophical axioms which are, consciously or unconsciously, at the root of most modern natural science, prevailed in great force over the mind of Dr. Hort. From this point of view, mind and its object stand over against one another, and in order to attain truth the mind has to empty itself, as far as possible, of all preconceptions, and passively accept that which is given from without.

Now it must be admitted that this attitude of mind is an ideal rather than a natural and necessary state. The demand for it is a more vivid and drastic form of Bacon's phrase already quoted, *natura parendo vincitur.* And it is also a less accurate form of the phrase; because, while Bacon leaves aside all the questions relating to the mode in which the mind apprehends existence, the modern form of statement assumes, consciously or unconsciously, a theory of knowledge which, to say the very least, is not proved. It is at least equally probable that the entirely unbiassed mind—the 'achromatic eye' with which M. Renan requires a true historian to be endowed—is not only not the necessary qualification for the purpose, but a sheer impossibility—a *chimaera bombynans in vacuo.* If there is any remote likelihood that this is true, then the scientific method requires careful scrutiny.

It is obviously at its safest when the subject-matter is purely abstract: in pure mathematics, or in abstract dynamics and in such regions, the analysis of the ideas dealt with is the less necessary, because, in the first place, the relation of the ideas to reality is comparatively unimportant; and, secondly, the ideas themselves being abstractions, the question of the mind's contribution to their formation requires no discussion. It would seem, to judge from such a work as Dr. Ward's *Naturalism and Agnosticism,* that the question of the value in terms of reality of such notions as these is becoming a pressing one, and that confusion has already been caused in the scientific region through the practical assumption of mechanical and dynamical principles as conveying information as to reality. But we need not enter into this: the method of careful investigation, and passive acceptance of results, is at its safest in these regions.

It is fairly safe, too, in all subject-matters of which the object is the mere collection of isolated facts, when the nature of such facts is not complex. For instance, the determination of the average rainfall in a given district needs only care in observation and accurate arithmetic. We may say, too, that such a method is generally free from danger in the examination of MSS with a view to the formation of a text. For in this matter the limits of possible variation are finite; the significance of the different variations is approximately known; and error would generally arise through lack of care in collecting the facts, or the importation of irrelevant ideas in the interpretation of them.

But when we come to historical inquiry the case has ceased to be simple, and it is here that we venture to think that Dr. Hort's reliance on the method usually valid in natural science has occasionally misled him. It is in this region that the purely passive attitude of acceptance seems to us most perilous; and this, not because it has ceased to represent a true scientific ideal, but because in this region it is an impossible ideal. It is, no doubt, of vital importance that when the history is conveyed through the medium of an ancient text, the words of the text should be interpreted with the strictest literalness. No true and historical interpretation can be based upon anything but a strictly literal translation. But when this is done, we have only reached the beginning of our real problem, and all its difficulties are still before us. If the text in question were a new discovery, a book arising, as it were, out of the grave, and detailing the history of an unknown and dead people, we should have nothing to do but to translate it, and leave it to tell its own story. But if the text itself is one among a number of related books, if it comes into contact with history of various kinds; still more, if it describes things which have been matters of controversy, then the difficulty of dealing scientifically with it is extreme. It is no longer to the purpose to wait and let the text, as it were, pour in its meaning upon a passive mind. Even the minute and careful consideration of a series of vital passages will give but a disjointed and incomplete result. The interpreter who will really reproduce the whole meaning of the text before him will have to take more active measures. He will have to consider the isolated passages in relation to the whole; he will have to understand the successive events described, not as a mere series, but as an evolution, that is, as the gradual unfolding of an immanent idea. Above all, he will attempt to determine the principles which are involved in any interpretation of the particular kind in question: for this is the most trustworthy protection against hidden bias and unconscious prejudice, and offers an attainable ideal of accuracy in place of the impossible and fallacious ideal of the achromatic eye.

It is probable that those who knew Dr. Hort personally, and to whom he opened his full mind, will find it difficult to follow our criticism. But yet it remains that to many *The Christian Ecclesia* seems a 'minimizing' book. That is, it seems through its intense reserve, through the severe self-control with which the series of passages has been interpreted, to have lost, in some measure, the sense of the whole. Though we may know independently that the changes which are described were, in the mind of the author, governed by the Holy Spirit, yet the history as it is given leaves upon the mind a sense, not of an evolution, but of a series of accidental events. Though it is laid down that a society is not a horde of individuals, and that its actions will therefore differ from those of a mere horde, yet the description of the early days seems, not perhaps more amorphous than any single passage considered in isolation will warrant, but infinitely more amorphous than the general drift of the passages would suggest, if considered as a series. It is possible that if the Lectures had received their author's final revision some of this effect might have been modified. We might have looked to find in them an estimate of the relation of the Parables of the Kingdom, with their strong implications of order and organization, to the ideal of the Church at work in the Apostles. We might have looked, perhaps, for a more articulate account of the way in which the Apostles passed from the position of mere witnesses—if indeed that was the limit of their original function—to that of actual governors; or for a fuller exposition of the continuity of the Acts of the Church in the history given us by St. Luke. These things might have been supplied; but we cannot conceal our conviction that *The Christian Ecclesia* is a case in which the method pursued with such brilliant success in other regions has revealed its inherent defect.

It is difficult to sum up in a few words what the outer world, apart from his friends and associates, owes to the work of this great scholar. Perhaps it may be expressed in these two sentences: he recalled us all to the free and exact study of the words of Holy Scripture; and, by the example of his unflinching gaze upon the truth as he could discover it, he vindicated many of the traditional beliefs which a more reckless criticism was assailing, and over which a world-weary pessimism had already despaired. A recent historian of the Universities of Europe has affirmed that Cambridge never produced a single first-rate Schoolman. If true, this is, doubtless, a serious misfortune for the University. But we venture to think that future historians will forget this lamentable omission, in view of the supreme greatness of some Cambridge scholars of this century; and of this class not the least will be F. J. A. Hort.

T. B. STRONG.

ANCIENT CORRECTIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (*Tiḳḳun Ṣopherim*).

THE student of the Old Testament is so much accustomed to the story of the scrupulous care with which the Scribes guarded the Sacred Text, counting even its letters, that it comes as a shock to him to be told that, according to Jewish tradition, he has before him in eighteen places of his Hebrew Bible not the original text, but a text altered by the Scribes! In these eighteen passages, if we may believe a statement which has been frequently made, and perhaps never fully disproved, the original reading was altogether displaced from the MSS, as being unbecoming (or, indeed, in some cases, almost blasphemous), and a Scribes' emendation took its place, the memory of the original reading being preserved in tradition only.

The fullest account of the matter in English is to be found in Dr. Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*[1]; and Mr. T. H. Weir devotes some pages to it in his *Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.* Dr. Buhl (*Kanon und Text des A. T.*, 1891) deals with the subject (pp. 103–105), and to some extent[2] accepts the theory (pp. 251 ff.). The 'Scribes' corrections,' in short, still attract considerable attention, and some of them are accepted by serious scholars.

Yet the evidence alleged for the theory is very thin. The early evidence is ambiguous, while what is unambiguous is too late to be of any real value. A Midrashic fancy; an ambiguous phrase; a misinterpretation; such seems to be the history of the growth of the doctrine of Scribes' emendation.

In the present paper I propose to examine the evidence with regard to the eighteen passages, in order to discover whether it is sufficient to prove that our present text is indeed an altered text, and that the original readings are really preserved in our 'traditional' sources.

---

[1] In which the theory of emendation is fully accepted.

[2] As far as regards the following passages:—Num. xi 15; 1 Sam. iii 13 (in part); Ezek. viii 17; Hab. i 12; Zech. ii 8 [12]; Job vii 20; Lam. iii 20.

The evidence which is to be the subject of this inquiry is derived from authorities which may be divided into three classes, viz. the Midrashic, the Masoretic, and the Exegetical (commentators).

(A.) MIDRASHIM. (These may be roughly described as homiletic commentaries on books of the Old Testament. They are broadly distinguished from later exegetical works, such as those of Rashi, Aben Ezra, and Ḳimḥi, by their lack of literal and grammatical exegesis and of purely critical matter.) Those useful for the present inquiry are:—

(i) *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864, p. 22 b), a very early work, revised in the second century of the Christian era, and again in the third[1].

(ii) *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann, Vienna, 1870, p. 39 a), composed in the second century, and revised perhaps towards the close of the same century[1].

(iii) Midrash *Tanḥuma* (Mantua, anno 323 = 1563 A.D., p. 32 b, col. 2), a late work in which *Mechilta* and an earlier Midrash *Tanḥuma* were used. The earlier *Tanḥuma*[2] (ed. S. Buber, Wilna, 1885) belongs to the fifth or sixth century.

To these some writers would add:—

(iv) *Yalkut Shimeoni* (ed. B. Lorje, Zolkiew, 1859), a compilation by R. Simon of Frankfort (1200–1250 A.D.) from the Midrashim. [Its evidence has not been cited in the important Table VI (below) owing to its secondary character.]

(B.) MASORETIC WORKS. (These deal with the text of the Old Testament, but rather as a fixed thing to be guarded in its integrity, than as subject to correction and improvement.) The chief of these are:—

(i) The printed Masorah found in Rabbinic Bibles (Bomberg's and Buxtorf's). (See the passage at the head of the book of Numbers, repeated in the margin of Ps. cvi 20.) Cited below as '*Masorah* (printed).'

---

[1] According to Schiller-Szinessy (*Encl. Brit.* MISHNAH) neither *Siphrē* nor *Mechilta* was written down before the sixth century A. D.

[2] According to Eppstein Buber's is the later recension. It does *not* contain the list of *tiḳḳun* passages.

(ii) The *Ochlah w'ochlah* (ed. Frensdorff, Hannover, 1864). There are two MSS of this work, one at Paris, from which Frensdorff printed his edition, containing four hundred articles, and one at Halle[1], containing over a thousand. This second MS, however, does not contain the list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* passages, so that there is grave doubt whether the list belongs to the original form of the book *Ochlah*. The book in one form or another is older than Ḳimḥi (1155–1235 A.D.) who quotes it by name.

(iii) The Masorah found in Yemen MSS (B. M. Orient. 1379 of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and 2349 of the year 1469 A.D., in the margin of Num. xii 12 (cf. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, p. 350).

(iv) The Masorah given at the foot of the page containing Zech. ii 12 [8] in the Codex *Petropolitanus Babylonicus* of the year 916 A.D., reproduced in facsimile by Herm. Strack, 1876.

(v) The list published from the Baer MS by S. Baer and H. Strack as an Appendix ('Anhang') to their edition of Ben Asher's Masoretic work *Diḳduḳē ha-ṭeamim*. The editors seem to think (p. 44, note) that the list may be the work of Ben Asher himself, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century. It is cited in this paper as Ben Asher.

To the Masoretic lists may be added the isolated marginal notes attached to particular passages in Biblical MSS, asserting in each case that the particular passage is '*tiḳḳun ṣopherim*,' or 'one of the eighteen *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' From the mass of MSS I have singled out a few. Each contains Masorah, and is representative of an important or seemingly important class of MSS.

(*a*) Camb. Univ. Add. 465. Sephardic of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Contains the whole Bible. Valuable for its Masorah; cf. Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS in Camb. Univ. Library*, pp. 18, 19.

(*b*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 2349. Yemenite of A. D. 1469. Contains the Pentateuch. Sometimes supposed to be valuable on account of its South Arabian origin.

(*c*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 1379 of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. Contains the Pentateuch. Probably also Yemenite.

(*d*) Codex *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (quoted from Strack's facsimile edition of 1876). Finished in the year 916 A. D. Contains the 'Later Prophets' (i.e. Isaiah to Malachi). Valuable as being pointed[2] on the supralinear system and therefore as being probably different in *provenance* from the bulk of Biblical MSS. (The supposition, however, implied in the title 'Babylonicus' that it has any connexion with Babylon, or with some other place situated equally far towards the East, lacks sufficient support to be probable.)

---

[1] Described by H. Hupfeld in *ZDMG* xxi 201–220.

[2] Three or four columns are left unpointed; see Zech. xiv 5; Mal. i 5.

(*e*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job ^{a}. A quarto fragment (centim. 37·5 × 38) of six leaves containing the beginning of Job. North African; 'very old' (Dr. Schechter). From the Genizah at Cairo.

(*f*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job ^{b}. A quarto (or folio) fragment consisting of the lower part of two leaves (centim. ? × 31). Contains some later verses of Job. Also from the Cairo Genizah[1].

(C.) COMMENTATORS.

(i) Rashi (obiit 1105 A. D.) of Troyes. I have compared the printed text of the Pentateuch as given in the Vienna Pentateuch (5 vols. 4to, 1859) with Camb. Univ. Add. 626, an important MS (fourteenth century) not used by Berliner for his edition (Berlin, 1866); see Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue*, p. 50. For the Prophets (Earlier and Later) I have compared the text printed in Bomberg's Bible (Venice, ed. 2) with Brit. Mus. Harley 150 of A. D. 1257, a MS which contains some important variations from the common text.

(ii) Aben Ezra (1090–1168 A. D.) of Toledo. I have compared the printed text in Job and Psalms with Brit. Mus. Add. 24896 (fifteenth century), and in Genesis and Numbers with Brit. Mus. Add. 26880 (A. D. 1401).

(iii) R. David Ḳimḥi (1155–1235 A. D.) of Narbonne.

Before tabulating and summarizing the evidence of the authorities specified above, I give two of the passages (one Midrashic from *Mechilta*, and one Masoretic from Cod. *Babyl. Petropol.*) in full, in order to illustrate the nature of this evidence.

(*a*) *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann, 1870, p. 39 a):—

'*And in the greatness of thine excellency thou overthrowest them that rise up against thee* [Ex. xv 7] that is "thou hast greatly magnified thyself against him who rose up against thee." And who are they who rose up against thee? They who rose up against thy sons. "Thou overthrowest them that rise up against *us*" is not written here, but "Thou overthrowest them that rise up against *thee*." It sheweth that every one who riseth up against Israel is as if he rose up against the Holy One (Blessed be He!) . . . And similarly it saith (וכה″א), *And he that toucheth them* (בהם) *is as he that toucheth the apple of his eye* [Zech. ii 8, not M.T.]. Rabbi Jehudah[1] saith, "The apple of an eye" it saith not, but "The apple of his eye" is written; it concerns (if such a thing may be said) the Exalted One, but the Scripture has employed euphemism (אלא שכינה הכתוב). Of the same class (כיוצא בו) is [the passage], *Ye say also, Behold what a weariness is it! and ye have snuffed at it* [Mal. i 13], but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *For the iniquity which he knew, because his sons did bring a curse upon themselves*[2], &c. [1 Sam. iii 13], but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee, so that I am a burden to myself* [Job vii 20]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Art not thou my king from everlasting, O Lord God, that we die not*[3] (ולא נמות) [Hab. i 12, not M.T.]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Hath a nation changed their gods which yet are no gods? but my people have changed their glory* [Jer. ii 11]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Thus they changed their glory for the likeness of an ox* [Ps. cvi 20]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. [4]*And let me not see my wretchedness* [Num. xi 15]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *We have no portion in David . . . every man to his tents, O Israel* [2 Sam. xx 1]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. *And, lo, they put the branch to their nose* [Ezek. viii 17]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. *When he cometh out of his mother's womb* [Num. xii 12]: (*from our mother's womb* one should have said:) the Scripture has employed euphemism. Also here thou sayest, *He that toucheth him* (בו) *is as he that toucheth the apple of his eye.* The Scripture speaketh (if such a thing may be said) concerning the Exalted One, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.'

---

[1] Dr. Schechter most kindly called my attention to (*e*), and I am indebted to him and to the Master of St. John's College for permission to examine (*f*).

(The passage from *Siphrē* reckoned above among the authorities for this paper is closely parallel, but offers a shorter text.)

It may be remarked on the passage from *Mechilta*:

(1) that the *Tiḳḳun* list seems to be ascribed to R. Jehudah

---

[1] R. Jehudah ben Ilai (first half of second century A.D.).

[2] Quoted from the R.V., which is used as far as possible for the quotations given in this paper.

[3] *Siphrē* (in the parallel place) reads, *that I die not* (ולא אמות), though otherwise it agrees with M.T.

[4] The usual formula seems to have fallen out.

ben Ilai, the pupil of R. Akiva and of R. Tarphon. (Notice the return to Zech. ii. 8 [12] at the close.)

(2) that the isolated emendation given, viz. that on Num. xii 12 is not free from suspicion of interpolation. It is indeed found in *Siphrē*; but here it reads like an addition to the original text. The text of most Midrashim seems to have been in a 'fluid' state during the early centuries.

(*b*) Cod. *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (in a footnote referring to Zech. ii 8 [12]):—

> 'Eighteen words are *tikkun sopherim*: *But Abraham* [Gen. xviii 22]: *My wretchedness* [Num. xi 15]: *Out of his mother's womb* [Num. xii 12]: *Did bring a curse* [1 Sam. iii 13]: *The branch* [Ezek. viii 17]: *We shall not die* [Hab. i 12]: *Have changed their glory* [Jer. ii 11]: *Each man*[1] *to your tents, O Israel* [1 Kings xii 16], twice in the verse; and the parallel passage of Chronicles, twice in the verse: *And yet had condemned* [Job xxxii 3]: *So that I am* [Job vii 20]: *Profane*[2] [Mal. i 12]: *And ye have snuffed* [Mal. i 13]: *Thus they changed* [Ps. cvi 20]: *Rob* [Mal. iii 8, 9]: *The apple of his eye* [Zech. ii 8].

This is the oldest Masoretic reference which we can date to *tikkun sopherim*. It may be remarked:—

(1) No kind of hint is given as to the nature of the process called *tikkun sopherim*.

(2) The list of passages differs from other lists of eighteen.

(3) No alternative reading is given in any passage.

Thus it can be seen that the ancient evidence of *Mechilta* and the Codex *Babylonicus* goes very little way indeed towards supporting the common theory of Scribes' emendation. We have two lists of Biblical passages, one of eleven, which speaks of the employment of euphemism in Scripture, the other of sixteen, which speaks of *tikkun sopherim* without giving any explanation of the phrase. The two lists between them suggest *at the most* one possible various reading. Not a promising beginning for those who wish to establish the common theory!

Most of the evidence which remains exists in a form similar to one or other of the two forms already given. For presenting this remainder tabular statements are most convenient, and accordingly six tables are given here, viz. (I) a table of the number of passages affected by *tikkun sopherim*, according to different authorities; (II) the identification of the passages according to Midrashic sources; (III) the same according to Masoretic sources; (IV) the same according to marginal notes in Biblical MSS; (V) the same according to the commentators Rashi and Aben Ezra; (VI) a table of the passages, their supposed 'original readings,' and the authorities for and against.

---

[1] The word איש, 'each man,' belongs rightly to 2 Sam. xx 1.

[2] A verb.

Table I.

The number of tiḳḳun ṣopherim *according to different authorities.*

Siphrē	7[1]
[Yalkut]	10[2]
[Midrash Haggadol]	10[3]
Mechilta	11
Rashi	11[4]
Masorah (printed)	[16[5]]
Tanḥuma (later form)[6]	18[7]
Masorah of Codex *Petropolitanus*	18[8]
Ochlah (Paris MS)[9]	18
Ḳimḥi	18[10]
Masorah of Yemenite MSS	18[11]
Ben Asher	18

[1] *Seven* instances (*eight* reckoning two in Num. xii 12) are given in Friedmann's edition, and Rashi (according to Brit. Mus. Harley 150, though not according to printed editions) says on Hab. i 12 that *seven* instances of *tiḳḳun* are found in *Siphrē.*

[2] Job vii 20 is omitted, perhaps through homoeoteleuton; otherwise the list is the same as in *Mechilta.*

[3] Num. xi 15 is omitted.

[4] On Mal. i 13 (printed text = B. M. Harley 150).

[5] Seventeen, if two instances are to be counted in Num. xii 12; eighteen according to the heading of the list.

[6] The passage giving a list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is absent from the (probably) earlier recension of *Tanḥuma* published by S. Buber.

[7] Counting two instances in Num. xii 12.

[8] Counting two *tiḳḳun* in Malachi not given in other sources, except that one appears in Ben Asher.

[9] The list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is absent from the Halle MS of *Ochlah.*

[10] On Ezek. viii 17.

[11] The list is the same in contents, but not in arrangement, with that in *Ochlah* (Paris MS).

TABLE II.

Midrashic Lists.

Second or third century. *Siphrē.*	Second century. *Mechilta*[1] (= *Yalkut*).	Century ? *Tanḥuma* (common recension).
Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8][2]
Job vii 20	Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13[2]
Ezek. viii 17	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13
Hab. i 12	[Job vii 20][3]	Job vii 20[2]
Ps. cvi 20	Hab. i 12	Hab. i 12[4]
Num. xi 15	Jer. ii 11	Jer. ii 11[2]
Num. xii 12	Ps. cvi 20	Ps. cvi 20[2]
	Num. xi 15	Hos. iv 7[2]
	2 Sam. xx 1	Job xxxii 3
	Ezek. viii 17[5]	Gen. xviii 22
	Num. xii 12[5]	Num. xi 15
		Num. xii 12[2]
Sixth century.		1 Kings xii 16
Breshith Rabba.		2 Chron. x 16
Gen. xviii 22		Lam. iii 20
		2 Sam. xvi 12[2]
		Ezek. viii 17[2]

---

[1] Rashi (on Mal. i 13) speaks of *eleven* words of ת' ס', but he includes (elsewhere) Gen. xviii 22 and Job xxxii 3, which do not appear among the eleven instances of *Mechilta*. For *Mid. Gad.* see Note II at the end of this article.

[2] Quoted according to the supposed original reading.

[3] Omitted (perhaps through homoeoteleuton) in *Yalkut*.

[4] Quoted with the reading ימות.

[5] Transposed in *Yalkut*.

TABLE III. *Masoretic Lists.*

Sixteenth century. *Masorah interior.* Printed in the Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf.	Fifteenth century. *Yemen Masorah.* (B.M. Orient. 1379 and 2349.)	916 A.D. *Masorah.* (Cod. *Petropolitanus Babylonicus.*)	Twelfth century? *Ochlah w'ochlah.* (Paris MS[1].)	Century? Ben Asher (Baer MS[2].)
Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22
Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15
Num. xii 12 (*semel*, חצי בשרו)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)	Num. xii 12 (*semel*, מרחם אמו)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)
1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13
2 Sam. xvi 12	2 Sam. xvi 12	Ezek. viii 17	2 Sam. xvi 12	2 Sam. xvi 12
2 Sam. xx 1	1 Kings xii 16 (*bis*)	Hab. i 12	1 Kings xii 16 (*semel*)	1 Kings xii 16 (*semel* vid.)
Ezek. viii 17	2 Chron. x 16 (*bis*)	Jer. ii 11	2 Chron. x 16 (*semel*)	2 Chron. x 16 (*semel* vid.)
Hab. i 12	Ezek. viii 17	1 Kings xii 16 (*bis*)	Jer. ii 11	Hab. i 12
Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13	2 Chron. x 16 (*bis*)	Ezek. viii 17	Mal. i 12
Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Job xxxii 3	Hos. iv 7	Mal. i 13
Jer. ii 11	Jer. ii 11	Job vii 20	Hab. i 12	Zech. ii 12 [8]
Job vii 20	Hos. iv 7	Mal. i 12	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Jer. ii 11
Hos. iv 7	Hab. i 12	Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13	Ps. cvi 20
Job xxxii 3	Job vii 20	Ps. cvi 20	Ps. cvi 20	Job vii 20
Lam. iii 20	Job xxxii 3	Mal. iii 8, 9	Job vii 20	Job xxxii 3
Ps. cvi 20	Lam. iii 20	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Job xxxii 3	Lam. iii 20
	Ps. cvi 20		Lam. iii 20	Hos. iv 7

---

[1] This list is wanting in the Halle MS.

[2] This list is published as an appendix to Baer and Strack's edition (1879) of Ben Asher's *Diḳduḳē ha-ṭᵉamim* (tenth century).

TABLE IV.

Passages to which the note ת' ס', or the like, is added in specified Biblical MSS.

Num. xi 15 (*a*) (*b*) (*c*)
Num. xii 12 (*b*) (*c*)
Ezek. viii 17 (*d*)
Zech. ii 12 [8] (*d*)
Mal. i 12 (*d*)
Mal. i 13 (*d*)
Job vii 20 (*e*)
Job xxxii 3 (*a*) (*f*)

(*a*) Camb. Univ. Add. 465 (whole Bible). (*b*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 2349 (Pentateuch). (*c*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 1379 (Pentateuch). (*d*) *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (Later Prophets). (*e*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job [a]. (*f*) Camb. Univ. T.-S. Collection, Job [b].

⁂ This Table is intended to illustrate the unsystematic way in which the note ת' ס' is added in the margin in MSS well furnished with Masorah. The results for (*d*) and still more for (*a*) are striking.

TABLE V.

Passages mentioned by Rashi and Aben Ezra[1] *in reference to* tikkun sopherim.

Rashi (asserts *tikkun*).	Aben Ezra[2] (repudiates *tikkun*).
Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22
Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15
Num. xii 12[3]	Num. xii 12
[1 Sam. iii 13][4]	[Ps. cvi 20[5]]
Hab. i 12	Job vii 20
Mal. i 13	Job xxxii 3
Ps. cvi 20[6]	Hab. i 12[7]
Job xxxii 3[8]	

---

[1] I have not examined fully the evidence of Kimhi, whose later date makes him of less importance as a witness, but according to the printed text he does not notice *tikkun* in connexion with Jer. ii 11; Hos. iv 7; Zech. ii 12 (*in locis*).

[2] Aben Ezra rejects the ordinary theory of *tikkun sopherim* in the *Sepher Çahoth*; and in his Commentaries he nowhere (so far as I can discover) accepts the *tikkun* tradition as yielding trustworthy textual evidence.

[3] Two instances according to the printed text, one only (אמנו for אמו) in C. U. Add. 626.

[4] In the printed text, but omitted in B. M. Harley 150.

[5] Aben Ezra deals with this passage as an instance of כינוי, comparing 2 Sam. xii 14, but he does not use the term ת' ס' in connexion with it.

[6] Not mentioned *in loco*, but cited on Job xxxii 3, according to the common texts, but not according to the Mendelssohnian Bible (Fürth, anno 565 [1805]).

[7] In the *Sepher Çahoth* p. 74 b.

[8] I have not been able to consult any MS with which to check the printed text, though the passage is an important one.

TABLE VI. *The* tiḳḳun *passages and their emendations.*

Passage according to M. T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms ת׳ס׳ or כינה הכ׳ to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(1) Gen. xviii 22, 'But Abraham stood yet before the Lord.'	'But the Lord stood yet before Abraham.'	Rashi. Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Tanḥuma; Bresh. R.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת׳ ס׳.']	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Mid. Gad.*
(2) Num. xi 15, 'And let me not look upon my wretchedness' ('evil,' ברעתי).	'And let me not look upon thy evil' (ברעתך).	Rashi (on Job xxxii 3). Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Masorah* (printed). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת׳ ס׳.']	(For *Mid. Gad.* see Note II at the end of this article.)
	'And let me not look upon their evil' (ברעתם).	Rashi, *in loco.*		
(3) Num. xii 12, 'Let her not be as one born dead, whose flesh is half consumed when he cometh forth from his mother's womb.'	'Let her not be as one born dead when he cometh out of our mother's womb, so that half of our flesh should be consumed.'	[*Mechilta* [1]]; *Tanḥuma* [2]; *Mid. Gad.* [1] Rashi [2]. Ben Asher [2]. *Ochlah* [2]. *Yemen Masorah* [2].	*Siphrē* [2]. *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed [3]). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת׳ ס׳.']	

[1] Single *tiḳḳun* ('Our mother').

[2] Double *tiḳḳun*.

[3] Single *tiḳḳun* ('Our flesh').

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Passage according to M. T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms ס׳ ת׳ or כינה הכ׳ to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(4) 1 Sam. iii 13, 'For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons were cursing themselves' (מקללים להם).	'For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons were cursing me' (מ׳ לי).	[Rashi (*in loco* כ׳ הכ׳).] *Ochlah.* *Mid. Gad.*	*Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	*Siphrē.*
	'. . . were cursing him.'	Ben Asher (*vid.*). *Yemen Masorah.*		
(5) 2 Sam. xvi 12, 'It may be that the Lord will look upon my eye' (בעיני)[1].	'. . . will look with his eyes' (בעיניו).	*Tanḥuma*, Stettin edition, anno 624 [1864].	*Masorah* (printed).	Rashi, *in loco.* *Siphrē.* *Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
	'. . . will look upon my trouble' (בענייי).	*Masorah* (printed). B. M. Orient. 1379.		
	'. . . will look with his eye' (בעינו).	*Tanḥuma*, Mantua edition, anno 323 [1563]. Ben Asher; *Ochlah.*		
(6) 2 Sam. xx 1, 'Every man to his tents (לאהליו), O Israel.'	[*vide infra.*]		*Mechilta.* *Masorah* (printed).	All other authorities.

---

[1] So Kri; 'on the wrong done unto me' R.V. following the C'thib, בעוני.

TABLE VI (*continued*).

1 Kings xii 16, ‘So Israel departed unto his tents’ (לאהליו).	[‘So Israel departed unto his gods’ (לאלהיו)[1].]	Ben Asher, *Ochlah*, *Yemen Masorah*, *Tanḥuma*[2] (all supplying same *tiḳḳun* in Chron.).	Cod. *Bab. Pet.*	*Siphrē.* *Mechilta.* Rashi, *in loco.*
(7) Ezek. viii 17, ‘And, lo, they put the branch to their nose’ (אל אפם).	‘And, lo, they put the branch to my nose’ (אל אפי).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* *Yemen Masorah.* R. D. Ḳimḥi.	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco.* Ben Asher.
	‘. . . his nose’ (אל אפו).	*Ochlah.*		
(8) Hab. i 12, ‘Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord, my God, my Holy One? we shall not die’ (לא נמות).	‘. . . my Holy One, [who] diest not’ (לא תמות).	Rashi, *in loco.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.* *Mid. Gad.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	
	‘. . . my Holy One, he who dieth not’ (לא ימות).	*Tanḥuma.*		
(9) Mal. i 13, ‘And ye have snuffed at it’ (אתו).	‘And ye have snuffed at me’ (אתי).	Rashi, *in loco.* *Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah* and *Yemen Masorah.*	*Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	*Siphrē.*

---

[1] The *Masorah* (of *Yemen* and of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*) has, it appears, a double *tiḳḳun*, ‘To thy gods . . . unto his gods.’ *Mid. Gad.* has ‘To thy gods’ only, and has no mention of Chron.

[2] Bible text influenced by 2 Sam. xx 1.

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Passage according to M.T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms ת׳ ס׳ or כינה הכ׳ to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(10) Zech. ii 12 [8], 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, . . . He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye' (עינו).	'. . . He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of my eye' (עיני).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah*[2]. *Shemoth R.* (§ 13).	*Siphrē.* [*Mechilta*[1].] *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco*. R. D. Ḳimḥi, *in loco*.
(11) Jer. ii 11, 'But my people have changed their glory (כבודו) for that which doth not profit.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi. R. D. Ḳimḥi. *Siphrē.*
(12) Job vii 20, 'Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee, so that I am a burden to myself?' (עלי).	'. . . So that I am a burden to thee' (עליך).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	[Aben Ezra[3].] *Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco*.
(13) Hos. iv 7, 'I will change their glory (כבודם) into shame.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	*Tanḥuma.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Masorah* (printed).	Rashi; R. D. Ḳimḥi. *Siphrē; Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
(14) Job xxxii 3, 'And yet they had condemned	'. . . condemned God' (or 'the Lord'	[Rashi, *in loco*[4].]	*Masorah* (printed). *Tanḥuma.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*

---

[1] See above, p. 391.

[2] B. M. Orient. 1379 is defective here.

[3] See below, p. 412.

[4] See below, p. 412.

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Job' (וירשיעו את איוב).	or — euphemistically —'the Judgement').	Ben Asher. [*Yemen Masorah* and *Ochlah*, 'condemned the Judgement,' an euphemism.]	[Aben Ezra, *i. l.*]	
(15) Lam. iii 20, 'And my soul (נפשי) is bowed down within me' (עלי).	'And my soul sinketh down upon thee' (עליך). 'And thy soul (נפשך) will mourn over me' (עלי)[1].	Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Masorah* (printed). *Tanḥuma.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* Rashi; Aben Ezra. Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
(16) Ps. cvi 20, 'Thus they changed their glory (כבודם) for the likeness of an ox.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.* *Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	[Rashi[2].] Aben Ezra[3].
(17) Mal. i 12, 'But ye profane it' (אתו).	'But ye profane me' (אתי).	Ben Asher.	*Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*).	Rashi. *Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Ochlah.* *Masorah* (*Yemen*, and printed).
(18) Mal. iii 8, 9, 'Ye rob me' (*bis*).	[Not known.]	[No authorities.]	*Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*).	All other authorities.

---

[1] So Dr. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, p. 361; Dr. Buhl, *Kanon des A. T.*, p. 105.

[2] See below, p. 411.

[3] See below, p. 411.

From a study of the contents of the foregoing tables we may draw several deductions:—

(1) The *tiḳḳun* tradition lacks definiteness as to (i) the number of passages affected, (ii) the identity of the passages, (iii) the nature of the change made or supposed to be made in the text.

(2) The tradition (in one form or another) is a favourite element in the Midrashim, including the earliest known.

(3) The tradition has not an undisputed position in the *Masorah*, as the following facts show:—

- (*a*) It is doubtful if it had a place in Ben Asher's *Diḳduḳē*.
- (*b*) It is not found in the Halle MS of *Ochlah*.
- (*c*) It is only casually noted in Biblical MSS which are provided with *Masorah*.
- (*d*) The authority of the printed *Masorah* (in which the *tiḳḳun* list is found) is doubtful, for it is not known whether it rests on direct authority of MSS or not.

(4) The two earliest commentators of greatest name either fail to support the tradition in its fullness (Rashi), or treat it as a thing which may be set aside (Aben Ezra).

From the first three of these deductions we may, I think, tentatively draw a fresh conclusion, viz. *The tiḳḳun tradition belongs rather to Midrash than to Masorah*, i. e. its true bearing is on exegesis, not on textual criticism; the *tiḳḳunē ṣopherim* are interpretations not readings. This conclusion can, I believe, be verified (i) by an examination of the terms used in the oldest authorities in rendering the tradition, (ii) by a detailed examination of the evidence alleged for each case of *tiḳḳun*.

(i) The terms used in our authorities with regard to these passages are many; *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is only one form out of a dozen. Yet a careful scrutiny leaves us with two formulas only which are ancient, from which all the rest appear to be derived; these two formulas are כינה הכתוב ('the Scripture has employed euphemism')[1] and תיקון סופרים ('scribes' correction')[2]. Now the first thing to be noted is that the latter formula is ambiguous, while the former bears an unmistakable meaning.

---

[1] *Siphrē*; *Mechiltâ*; *Ochlah*; Ben Asher; [*Yemen Masorah*; *Tanḥuma*].

[2] *Breshith Rabba*; *Masorah* of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* [and of Yemen]; printed *Masorah*; [*Tanḥuma*].

The phrase 'the Scripture[1] has employed euphemism' is irreconcilable with the theory that the text of Scripture has been altered by transcribers. It means not that a euphemism has been introduced into Scripture, but that it was already found there and noted. The second phrase ת׳ ס׳ 'scribes' correction' stands on different ground. It is ambiguous, and *two* views of its meaning seem to have been taken by the Jews themselves.

According to one view *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* was a *viva voce* correction (or modification) of Scriptural language authorized for homiletic purposes by the Scribes. This seems to be the meaning of the phrase adopted in the printed Masorah and in Ben Asher. The printed Masorah heads its list with the title י״ח מלין בקריאה תקון סופרים, 'the eighteen expressions [which] in reading [are] *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' Similarly Ben Asher introduces his list with the remark that *They are not written according to their tiḳḳun, but the wise men of Israel read them with tiḳḳun ṣopherim* (קורין אותם בת׳ ס׳[2]). The scribes interpret a supposed euphemism, and their interpretation is called *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.

The other sense given to the phrase *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* seems to be that of a 'change' (mental, not written) made by the original writers or redactors of Scripture. 'Our Rabboth' writes Rashi[3] 'turned back in writing thus' (on Gen. xviii 22), i.e. they recoiled from putting into writing a thought which some of their readers might expect them to express. A number of phrases in which the *tiḳḳun* is connected with Ezra and the Great Synagogue arise, it seems, from this view.

Such phrases are :—

(1) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra' (margin of Yemenite Masorah).

(2) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra and the scribes' (Cod. Taylor-Schechter, Job ^{b}).

(3) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra and Nehemiah and Zechariah and Haggai and Baruch' (Cod. Taylor-Schechter, Job ^{a}).

(4) '*Tiḳḳun* of the scribes, even of the men of the Great Synagogue' (*Tanhuma*).

(5) '*Tiḳḳun* of the scribes, or as some say *Tiḳḳun* of Ezra' (*Yemen Masorah*).

---

[1] The Heb. הכתוב corresponds with the Greek τὸ γεγραμμένον or τὸ γραφέν.

[2] Surely not 'call them *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.'

[3] Or the editor of Rashi's Commentary, see below, p. 405.

To these may be added:—

(6) ‘Ezra made a *tiḳḳun*’ (תקן עזרא; *Ochlah* in its heading to the passages).

(7) ‘The scribes made a *tiḳḳun*’ (Rashi on Job xxxii 3)[1].

Probably the *tiḳḳun* tradition is connected with the tradition which ascribes the redaction of several books of Scripture to the Great Synagogue. According to 4 Esdras xiv 19 ff., Ezra, with five companions, re-wrote under inspiration the Law (the whole Old Testament apparently; *omne quod factum est in saeculo ab initio, quae erant in lege tua inscripta*) which had been burnt, presumably by the Chaldeans. This tradition was a favourite one with the Fathers, from Irenaeus downwards (Bensly-James, *Fourth Book of Ezra*, *Texts and Studies*, vol. iii, no. 2, p. xxxvii), but in origin it is almost certainly Jewish. Certainly those scholars who disbelieve in the existence of the Great Synagogue ought to feel their belief in the ordinary doctrine of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* shaken.

(ii) It now remains to examine each instance of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* by itself, in order to decide by a consideration of external evidence, and of internal probability, whether it is likely that our present text is an altered form, and that the original form is preserved in the *tiḳḳun* tradition.

The first passage to be examined is Gen. xviii 22. It is not marked as *tiḳḳun* in the earliest Midrashim, *Siphrē* and *Mechilta*, but the *Breshith Rabba* (sixth century) xlix 7, has the remark, ‘R. Simon said, This is *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, for the Shechinah was tarrying for Abraham.’ The fuller form of the same comment is preserved in the *Midrash Shemoth* (not earlier than the tenth century?) xli 4, ‘R. Simon said, Come and see what is written, *And the men rose up from thence and looked toward Sodom* (Gen. xviii 16), &c. It was due [for the Scripture] to say (לא היה צריך לומר אלא), *And the Lord stood yet before Abraham*, but it is *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.’ The tradition quoted in the name of R. Simon is to the effect that the author of the text quoted wrote one thing, when it was to be expected that he would have written quite another. He employed euphemism. There is nothing here of a transcriber emending the text which lay before him. The comment of Rashi on this place is based upon R. Simon's tradition, but it is somewhat fuller in wording. Its conclusion runs thus, 'This is *tikkun sopherim*; [for our Rabboth made a change ("turned back") in writing thus (שהפכו רבותֹ לכתוב כן [1])].' The bracketed words (the genuineness of which is doubtful), though at first sight they seem to favour the common theory of *tikkun sopherim*, will nevertheless bear an explanation which yields no support to the theory. 'Our Rabboth' may be identified with the *sopherim* just mentioned, and by the *sopherim* we may understand, as has been said above, the original writers or redactors of books of Scripture. The statement that these writers or redactors 'made a change' or 'turned back' in writing ver. 22 b is easy of explanation. After writing that '*the* [*three*] *men*' *went towards Sodom*, the natural continuation was to write, *But the Lord stood yet by* (על [2]) *Abraham*. But something checked the pen before it could write the bold words; there was a *change*, and the Scripture ran, *But Abraham stood yet before the Lord.* Thus since the meaning of the clause is ambiguous and its genuineness doubtful, this comment does not justify us in counting Rashi as a witness for the common theory of *tikkun sopherim*. It may be added that the versions (Targum, Peshitta, LXX [3], Vulgate) give no hint of the supposed 'original reading.' Α′ Σ′ Θ′ in Field's *Hexapla* are silent. Kautzsch and Socin in their German edition of Genesis (1888), in which the 'Quellenschriften' are distinguished typographically, take the 'original reading' into the text. Delitzsch, however, who had more Rabbinical learning than Kautzsch and Socin, rejects it.

---

[1] The terms in which *tiḳḳun* (or *kinnui*, as the writer prefers to call it) is described in Ben Asher are at first sight mutually contradictory. The list itself begins thus:—‘*And Abraham stood yet.* “And the Lord stood yet” it was, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.’ The phrase ‘it was’ (היה) is, however, probably an abbreviation of the phrase used in *Ochlah*, ‘One should have said’ (הצ״ל). [Cf. the היה לו נומר of *Mechilta* (on Num. xii 12).] The preface to the list denies that the *ṣopherim* ‘blotted out and wrote afresh.’

The next instance is Num. xi 15. Here *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, p. 25 a) gives the paraphrase, 'Let me not look upon the retribution which is to come *upon them.*' Rashi accordingly writes *in loco*, '*Their wretchedness* (or "*their evil*" ברעתם) one should have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism; and this is one of the *tikkunē sopherim*[1] for the euphemizing and correction (תקון) of the language.' The same writer, however (on Job xxxii 3), has a different remark on the text of Num. xi 15. He writes: '*Thy wretchedness* (or "*Thy evil*" ברעתך) one should have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.' Thus we have two 'original readings' offered us by one authority in the place of the present Masoretic reading, *My wretchedness*. The inference can hardly be avoided that *Siphrē* and Rashi are not stating facts, but offering suggestions; they are as it were playing with the text in order to point out that Moses' evil was the people's evil, and that a people's evil was their God's evil. This is plainly the view of Aben Ezra (*in loco*) who points out that the reading *My wretchedness* gives good sense, and then adds 'and there is no need for *tikkun sopherim*.' This is not the way in which one would speak of a real variant. Again the versions (Targum, Peshitta[2], Vulgate[3]) give no support to the 'original reading.' LXX B has τὴν κάκωσιν *sine add.*, a reading which may be significant, but cod. A and Lucian have μου, and the Lyons Pentateuch (O. L.) *meam*, in agreement with the M.T. Α′ Σ′ Θ′ in Field are silent. The common interpretation of the *tikkun* tradition breaks down hopelessly in this instance. The evidence for classing Num. xi 15 among the *tikkun* (or *kinnui*) passages is very early (*Siphrē* and *Mechilta*), but early evidence fails to prove that a genuine various reading of this verse has been preserved by tradition.

---

[1] Quoted from C. U. Add. 626; the clause is omitted in some MSS, cf. Berliner, *in loco*.

[2] So Rashi (according to C. U. Add. 626).

[3] Cod. A; Lucian; *hiat* B.

Num. xii 12. On this passage *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, p. 28 a) comments as follows:—

> '*From the womb of his mother.* [It should be,] "From the womb of *our* mother," but the Scripture has employed euphemism in respect to this phrase. *And half of his flesh is consumed.* "Half of *our* flesh" ought to have been said (היה צריך לומר) in the sense in which that expression is used in the passage, *For he is our brother, our flesh.*'

Rashi (*in loco*) has a similar comment, based no doubt on *Siphrē*. But it is important to note that there is no assertion either in Rashi or in the *Siphrē* of an alteration of the text by early transcribers. The *Siphrē* simply points out that a certain passage would yield good sense, if read differently from the traditional reading. Such remarks on the text are not uncommon in Midrashim and in the Talmud[1]. That the *tiḳḳun* tradition has here preserved a true various reading is a statement wholly devoid of support. No version preserves the supposed ‘original reading.’ The *wĕlā nehwē*, with which the Peshitta[2] renders אל תהי, comes probably from the μὴ γένηται of the LXX (which often influences the present text of the Peshitta), and should not be rendered (as in Walton's Polyglot) by *et non simus*. The ἐκ μήτρας μητρός *sine add.* and the σαρκῶν αὐτῆς of the LXX and the paraphrase of the Targum (‘Pray now for the dead flesh which is in her’) in no way suggest the בשרנו of the *tiḳḳun*, though they show that the אמו and בשרו of the M.T. gave trouble to translators.

---

[1] I omit the word בתורה, 'in the Law,' with C. U. Add. 626.

[2] Verified. *Lee* = B. M. Add. 14425 (A. D. 464); Cod. Ambrosianus; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Ne tantis afficiar malis.*

1 Sam. iii 13. Here neither the *Mechilta* nor Rashi asserts that the scribes made an alteration in the text. The latter writes, *in loco*:—

> ‘*Because his sons were cursing them* (להם). *Cursing me* (לי) one ought to have said (היה לו לומר), but the Scripture has employed an euphemism.’ [The comment is absent from B. M. Harley 150.]

In this instance the versions offer readings which need some consideration. The Peshitta[3], either paraphrasing להם or reading לעם, gives *were reviling the people*. The Greek (Codd. AB and Lucian), however, is more suggestive; it reads κακολογοῦντες θεὸν [οἱ] υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ. Similarly Lucifer of Cagliari (a valuable authority for the Old Latin), as cited by Sabatier, gives *Quoniam contemnentes Dominum mala locuti sunt filii eius*. Thus we have Rashi, the LXX, and Lucifer agreeing that the object of the verb *were reviling* is not להם. On the other hand the difference between Rashi and the LXX, and again between the LXX and Lucifer, as to the actual word to be supplied, shows us that their agreement is on a matter of interpretation, not of reading. We can read neither לי with Rashi, nor θεόν with the LXX; evidence such as this does not carry us behind the reading מקללים להם.

---

[1] ‘Playing’ with the Text.—Bab. Talm. *Ḥăgigah* (fol. 13 a) on Prov. xxvii 26 (*The lambs are for thy clothing*) :—‘Do not read it *lambs* (כבשים), but *hidden things* (כבושים).’

Bab. Talm. *Shabbath* (fol. 55 a) on Ezek. ix 6 (*and begin at my sanctuary*) :—‘Do not read it *at my sanctuary* (ממקדשי) but *at my sanctified ones* (ממקודשי).’

In neither case is the ‘emendation’ put forward as an existing variant, but simply as an occasion for a particular lesson to be enforced.

[2] Verified. *Lee* = B. M. Add. 14425; Cod. Ambrosianus; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Lee* = Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. Add. 1964; edition of Urmi.

2 Sam. xvi 12. Rashi's comment on this passage is simply, '*The Lord will look upon my eye*, i. e. upon the tears of my eye' (so Targum). Clearly the commentator did not include this passage in his list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim.* Neither do the versions testify to the supposed original reading of the passage. LXX (codd. A B [Lucian]) gives ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει μου (i. e. בעניי[1] for בעיני). Field gives no variants from LXX. The Masorah itself, as represented by the Kri and C'thib, reads for the former *upon my eye*, and for the latter *upon my iniquity* (or *upon my punishment*), and altogether ignores such a reading as *with his eye.* Peshitta[2] and Vulgate agree with LXX.

On 2 Sam. xx 1 Rashi has no note at all. The Peshitta[3], Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, agree with the M.T. No variation from the ordinary text is cited in Field. In 1 Kings xii 16, and in the passage parallel with it, 2 Chron. x 16, the Peshitta[3], Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, give no hint of any reading 'gods' for 'tents.' Field cites no variant from the later Greek versions. Rashi is silent on 1 Kings xii 16; on 2 Chron. x. 16 he has a note, but no mention of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim.*

On Jer. ii 11 neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi[4] has any note. The LXX, Peshitta[5], Vulgate, and Aquila *apud* Field, agree with the M.T. Theodotion and Symmachus are not cited. The rendering of the Targum seems to represent the כבודו of the M.T., 'They have forsaken my service for the sake of which I bring upon them glory.'

Ezek. viii 17. Rashi has a long note on this passage, but makes no mention of *tiḳḳun.* Ḳimḥi, however, remarks '*Their nose*: it means (רוצה לומר) *my nose*, but the Scripture has employed euphemism, and it is one of the eighteen words which are *tikkun ṣopherim*.' The versions give no support to a reading אפי. The LXX (ὡς μυκτηρίζοντες) is perhaps too free a rendering for absolute certainty, but the three later Greek versions *apud* Field, and the Peshitta[1], Targum, and Vulgate support אפם without doubt.

---

[1] So the printed *Masorah* in quoting this passage among the eighteen, though it does not profess to give the 'original reading' of any passage affected by *tiḳḳun ṣopherim.* B. M. Orient. 1379 also has בעניי.

[2] *Lee* = Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. Add. 1964; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Lee* (1 Kings xii 16) = Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. Add. 1964; edition of Urmi.

[4] Aben Ezra seems not to have commented on Jeremiah.

[5] The reading of *Lee* (here and in the instances in Ezek., Hos., Hab., Zech., and Mal.) has been verified by comparison with Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. 'Ll. 2. 4' (Edessa, 1173 A. D.); and C. U. Add. 1965 (Nestorian, fifteenth century).

Hos. iv 7. Neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi makes any mention of a variation here. The LXX and Vulg. agree with the M.T. No variation from the M.T. is recorded in Field from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. On the other hand the Targum (with which the Peshitta[2] agrees almost *ad literam*) has what is almost a *tikkun* of its own, יקרהון בקלנא חליפו 'they changed their glory for shame.'

Hab. i 12. Rashi writes:—

> 'The prophet says, And thou, wherefore dost thou keep silence at all this? *Art not thou from everlasting, my God, my Holy One, who diest not* (אשר לא תמות). And this which is written *We shall not die* (לא נמות) is one of the *tikkunē ṣopherim* which are in Scripture, for the Scripture has employed euphemism; cp. (וכן), *And ye have snuffed at it* [Mal. i 13], and there are seven[3] similar instances which are set forth in *Siphrē*. And according to the *tikkun ṣopherim* the interpretation is this, *Art thou not my God from everlasting? My Holy One, give me not for death into his hand*.'

Again LXX and Vulg. agree with M.T., except that with *Siphrē* and *Mechilta* they read ולא for לא. Field gives no Greek variant, but Symmachus, quoted by Jerome, gives 'ut non moreremur' an idiomatic rendering of the Masoretic text.

The Targum, however, reads מימרך קיים לעלמין, which is a paraphrase of לא תמות. [The Peshitta[4], דלא נמוס ('without law!'), is probably a corruption of דלא נמות, which should be taken in agreement with the M.T. as a first person plural.] Lastly, it must be noted that *Siphrē* quotes the passage with ולא אמות for לא נמות. If the text were otherwise settled, we might pass over this fresh reading as due simply to inaccurate quotation, but under the circumstances we are bound to take note of it. We are left, then, with three possible readings

---

[1] Verified; *cf.* note [5], p. 408.

[2] Verified.

[3] B. M. Harley 150 reads וכן ז המה for the וכן הרבה of the printed text.

[4] Verified.

(1) נמות M.T., LXX, Vulg. [Pesh.?]; (2) תמות Targum; (3) אמות *Siphrē*. To these must perhaps be added (4) ימות *Tanḥuma*[1]. It must be confessed that the weight of the evidence thus displayed is decidedly in favour of the נמות of the M.T., and the *tiḳḳun* tradition does not turn the scale in favour of תמות. The Targum contains a Midrashic element, and its reading here is not improbably a Midrashic play on the original reading, viz. that of the Masoretic Text. It should be mentioned here that the tendency to avoid anthropomorphism is far from universal in Talmudic and Rabbinic literature. Sometimes an exactly opposite tendency makes itself strongly felt. Thus in *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, 22 b) it is said that when Israel went into exile to 'Edom,' the Shechinah was with them, and when they return *the Shechinah will return* with them.

Zech. ii 12 [8]. Neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi mentions *tiḳḳun* in connexion with this passage. LXX and Peshitta read עינו 'his eye,' Targum עיניו 'his eyes.' The Vulgate, however (as printed in Stier and Theile), has 'tangit pupillam oculi mei' (i. e. עיני the alleged 'original reading'), but some MSS (affected, perhaps, by the LXX through the Old Latin) read *eius* or *sui* for *mei*. Field cites nothing here from the later Greek versions. It is not uninteresting that *Siphrē*, *Mechilta*, *Shemoth R.* (§ 13), and the printed *Masorah*, together with five [seven] MSS cited by Kennicott, give כנוגע for נוגע, and that LXX has ὡς ἁπτόμενος, and the Targum כרמושיט ידיה למיקרב. One spirit of glossing inspired them all.

Mal. i 12. This instance is without visible means of support from versions and commentators. As an interpretation it is correct: *Ye profane it* means *Ye profane my name*, *Ye profane me.*

Mal. i 13. Rashi[2] writes (*in loco*):—

'*Ye say also*, *Behold a weariness*, i. e. a lean beast and one driven away (ונהלאה), for we were poor and there was no power in our hands to vow choice offerings; and in this sense Jonathan has interpreted, *Behold we brought our fulness* ("the best that we had"). *And ye have snuffed at it* (והפחתם אותו). This is one of the eleven words of *tiḳḳun*. *At me* they pointed [the word] (נקדו[2]), but the Scripture has employed euphemism, and *at it* is written (וכתו׳ אותו). *And ye have snuffed* [*at it*], i.e. "and ye have made [it] waste away"; [הפחתם] is in the sense of blowing away with the breath. [*Ye have snuffed*] *at me* and at my table.'

---

[1] In *Tanḥuma* most of the passages are quoted in their 'original' form, so that ימות is strictly speaking a variant of תמות.

[2] Emended from B. M. Harley 150, which varies considerably from Bomberg's text (2nd edit.).

This passage suggests no alteration of the consonantal text at all. It tells us that *punctators* (all or some only?) added a point to suggest the reading of י for ו. The written text, however, is clearly stated to be אותו (*at it*); the אותי (*at me*) is simply an unveiling of a supposed euphemism of Scripture. The versions here give an uncertain sound. The Targum, the Vulgate, and Cod. א and Cod. 311 (according to H. P.) of the LXX as well as the Complutensian edition support the Masoretic Text. On the other hand the Peshitta has *w'nephḥēth b'hōn* (Cod. Ambros.), 'And I rejected them' (the sacrificers), or (C. U. 'Ll. 2. 4'; C. U. Add. 1965) *b'hēn* 'them' (the sacrifices). Similarly LXX (ABQΓ) has *ἐξεφύσησα αὐτά*.

Mal. iii 8, 9. Here the expression אתם קבעים 'ye rob' (R.V.) is supposed to be substituted for the original reading, and it has been supposed that the πτερνίζετε (=אתם עקבים) 'ye attack in the rear' or 'ye trip up' of the LXX represents this original reading. But the supposition lacks support; one only of our authorities mentions Mal. iii 8, 9, as a *tiḳḳun* passage at all, and even that one does not give us the alleged displaced reading. It seems, in fact, that the LXX guessed, as do the rest of the versions, at the meaning of a rare and obscure word. Α'Σ'Θ' give ἀποστερεῖτε; Vulgate *configitis*; Peshitta *ṭāl'min* 'ye injure'; Targum מרגזין קדמי 'ye provoke me.' From a passage so obscure it is well to keep out the obscure subject of *tiḳḳun*, since there is so little authority for introducing it.

Ps. cvi 20. Here Rashi (*in loco*) gives no hint of any variation [1], but Aben Ezra writes:—

> '*Thus they changed their glory.* An euphemism for *the glory of the Name* [2]; cp. [2 Sam. xii 14] *Because thou hast verily despised* [*the enemies of the Lord*]. And there the euphemistic expression is in reference to David the king by way of reproof; and he said not to him, *Because thou hast verily despised the Name.*'

With this note of Aben Ezra agrees the Targum ופרגון ית איקר ריבוניהון, 'and they changed the glory of their Lord,' but the agreement need not necessarily be more than an agreement in interpretation. Aben Ezra does not say anything about a change of *reading*. LXX B, Peshitta, and Vulgate support the M.T. The LXX variant τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (ℵ$^{c.a}$ ART) is probably a corruption introduced from the parallel place (Jer. ii 11). Field is silent.

---

[1] But see his comment (quoted below) on Job xxxii 3.

[2] i.e. 'the glory of Jehovah.'

Job vii 20. On this passage Rashi mentions no variant, but Aben Ezra writes:—

'*So that I am a burden to myself* (עלי). A *tikkun sopherim* although the interpretation is certain (נכון) without a *tikkun*.'

The LXX here stands alone among the versions in supporting the alleged original reading; it reads εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ (=עליך) φορτίον. (This σοί may, however, be derived from the σοῦ of the previous clause.) Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate agree with the M.T. Field is silent.

Job xxxii 3. Here Rashi writes:—

'*And yet they had condemned Job.* This is one of the verses in which the scribes have corrected (תקנו סופרים) the language of Scripture; *and they passed by their silence a condemnatory judgement in reference to the Omnipresent* (וירשיעו כלפי המקום) one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism (כינה הכתוב). Compare [Ps. cvi 20], *Thus they changed their glory for the likeness of an ox; my glory* one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism[1]. Compare also [Num. xi 15], *And let me not look upon my wretchedness* ("my evil"); *on thy evil* one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Compare also many places [cited] in *Siphrē* and in the Masorah *magna*.'

Aben Ezra on the other hand (*in loco*) writes:—

'And it is written (וכתוב) that it is an instance of *tikkun sopherim*, but they who say so, know that which has been hidden from me.'

Three of the versions (Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate) reproduce the M.T., while the LXX gives no support to the supposed original reading, for it has καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀσεβῆ, with the variant εὐσεβῆ, which is plainly a secondary reading. Α'Σ'Θ' *apud* Field are silent.

Lam. iii 20. Neither Rashi nor Aben Ezra (whose commentary on Lamentations, however, is rather slight) mentions a variant. The versions, Peshitta, Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, support the M.T. There is nothing in Field to support the *tiḳḳun*.

---

[1] This whole sentence is omitted in the *Fürth* Bible (anno 565 = 1805 A.D.).

CONCLUSION.

I have already drawn tentatively (p. 402) the conclusion that the *tiḳḳun* tradition is not Masoretic (i. e. textual), but Midrashic (i. e. exegetical or, more accurately, homiletic). This conclusion was based on the nature of the documents in which the *data* of the subject are contained; it is supported further by the consideration of each passage in detail. There is no confirmatory evidence in favour of the 'original reading' of Gen. xviii 22. Of Num. xi 15 the utmost which can be said is that the reading of LXX B throws a slight doubt on the M. T. In Num. xii 12 the two 'original readings' are impossible as readings, possible only as flights of homiletic fancy. In 1 Sam. iii 13 the M. T. is probably corrupt, and the tradition of the *ṣopherim* may be said to be no worse than the emendations of the Peshitta and the A. V. The reading restored in 2 Sam. xvi 12 is simply a homiletic fancy. The 'original reading' alleged in the group of passages consisting of 2 Sam. xx 1; 1 Kings xii 16; 2 Chron. x 16 is merely a theological reflexion. A similar remark may be made regarding the group, Jer. ii 11; Hos. iv 7; Ps. cvi 20. In Ezek. viii 17 the obscurity of the heathen rite alluded to has opened the door to the play of fancy. In Hab. i 12 we get a very early and very daring homiletic flight; that is all. In Zech. ii 12 [8] the meaning of the M. T. and of the 'original reading' is the same in substance, only if we read עיני we introduce a change of speaker between שלחני and the end of the verse; no 'reverence' is saved by the עינו of the M. T. As regards Mal. i 12 and 13 and Job xxxii. 3 the *tiḳḳun* tradition is simply theological comment. Mal. iii 8, 9 is an instance too obscure to be discussed further. Job vii 20 is a difficult passage which the 'original reading' makes more difficult still. Lam. iii 20, according to the M.T., yields satisfactory sense, no other reading has any support from the versions.

The whole evidence leads us back to the play of homiletic fancy on Zech. ii 12 [8] (*Siphrē*, *Mechilta*, *Tanḥuma*, Cod. *Bab. Pet.*) and to a parallel play of the same fancy on Num. xi 15; xii 12 (printed and Yemen *Masorah*). The homiletic commentators found parallels for these first three passages, and passage was linked with passage until the chain was long. Next the purpose of the list was misunderstood in some quarters and the list was introduced (but by no means invariably[1]) into Masoretic works, at first as an appendix[2]. Scholars like Aben Ezra, Ben Asher, and Ben Addereth protested against popular notions regarding *tikkun ṣopherim*, but the list when once placed among the traditions of *Masorah* continued to be misunderstood and the effects of the mistake are with us to-day.

W. EMERY BARNES.

---

[1] *Not* in the Halle MS. of *Ochlah*.

[2] Ben Asher.

NOTE I. Dr. Schechter has pointed out to me that the number 'eighteen' appears in *Shemoth Rabba* v 5 as the number of the places which the LXX translators 'changed for Ptolemy the king.' Elsewhere these alterations are reckoned at 'thirteen' or 'fifteen,' and not more than *fifteen* instances are ever specified. From this and many other like facts 'eighteen' would seem to be a merely symbolic number.

NOTE II. Dr. Schechter kindly allows me to make use of a MS in his own possession (*Bamidbar*, paper, 23 lines to a page, 10$\frac{1}{2}$ in. × 7$\frac{5}{8}$in., foll. 242) of the *Midrash Haggadol*, of which he is preparing an edition ('*M. H.* edited from Yemen MSS by S. S., Camb. University Press'). It is cited in Table VI as *Mid. Gad.* It agrees in the list (foll. 70 b, 71 a) of *tikkun* passages in contents (but not in order) with *Mechilta*, except that it has 1 Kings xii 16 instead of 2 Sam. xx 1, and that it omits Num. xi 15. This last passage should perhaps be added to the text of *Mid. Gad.* to make up the number *eleven*, for the Midrash *in loco* (fol. 62 a, line 7) seems to base its comment on the reading ברעתם. Unlike *Mechilta* the *Midrash Haggadol* adds in its list the 'original reading' of each passage. Like *Yalkut* it cites with the formula, 'Similarly thou sayest' (כיוצא בו אתה אומ̇).

DOCUMENTS

TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. JOHN IN GREEK AND MIDDLE EGYPTIAN.

THE manuscript from which the following texts are transcribed was acquired from Egypt some years ago by the British Museum, where it bears the number Or. 5707. It is by the kindness of Professor R. K. Douglas that I am permitted to publish it here.

The MS consists of twelve conjugate leaves and one single leaf of parchment, making 26 pages, being quire ⲅ complete in eight leaves, and five of quire Δ. A page, when complete, measured 27 × 23 cm. Scarcely one, however, is now intact; worms or mice have often eaten far into the leaf, and damp and dirt have rendered several passages illegible. Beyond this, the MS is a palimpsest, and the texts here dealt with, being the earlier, are often further obscured by the later writing, of which the ink is much darker.

The text is in two columns of 20 or 21 lines each, the height of a column varying from 18½ to 21½ cm. There are some nine to twelve letters in ordinary lines; less where a clause ends. On palaeographical grounds the MS may be assigned to the sixth century. The script is a large upright uncial, of the type of the *Cod. Marchalianus* (Q) in the letters ⲁ, ⲇ, ⲕ, ⲗ, ⲙ, ⲩ, ⲱ; but in ⲉ, ⲟ, ⲥ the forms are quite rounded, as in *Cod. Dubl. rescript.* (Z), or in Zoega's class iii or iv[1]. The fragment shows those two distinguishing marks of the older Middle Egyptian MSS—the letter ϣ with an extra backward curve in the tail, and the ϭ in the upside-down position[2].

Initials are slightly enlarged, recede beyond the other lines, and are accompanied by a short horizontal stroke above them in the margin. No other ornament is found.

The punctuation is difficult to reproduce with accuracy, owing to the condition of the MS. I have printed the colon—the sole stop that occurs—only where I could certainly see it. The Greek text has no breathings or accents; superlineation in the Coptic is rare, and has

[1] *Catal. Codd. Copt.* tabb. II, III.

[2] Cf. Krall in *Mitth. a. d. Samml. Rainer* I, 111, and Crum, *Coptic MSS from the Fayyûm* p. 1.

been omitted here. It should, however, be noted that the ϕϯ has the stroke above it[1], and that some short words with consonantal endings have the comma, e. g. ⲉⲃⲁⲗ’. ⲛ terminating a line is represented by a stroke, not now in every case visible; and this system is preserved in the transcript.

The older text consists of St. John's Gospel iii 5 to iv 49 (but with iv 19–23 and 35–45 partially wanting), in Greek and Coptic—the former occupying the first, the latter the second column on each page. From the quire-marks we may assume that the volume originally began with this Gospel. Both Greek and Coptic texts are continuous in the MS: for the convenience of readers they are here broken up into paragraphs.

Several fragments of similar bilingual MSS are known; the special interest of this one lies in the dialect of its Coptic text. That dialect is one of those classed together as 'Middle Egyptian'; but whether it represents the idiom of the Fayyûm, or that of the Memphitic neighbourhood, cannot yet be decided, owing to the lack of any standard by which to recognize the distinguishing characteristics of these. It is probable that in early times a much larger number of spoken dialects existed in the Nile valley than our present written material represents. That material shows us, at any rate, the Sa'idic as the clearly-defined written idiom of all the southern districts, from Nubia[2] to beyond Thebes. Some fragments remain to exemplify its early northward spread over the province of the ancient dialect of Achmîm[3]. Certain features differentiate slightly the MSS of Eshmunein from those of Thebes, but further down the river, at Taha near Minyeh, we meet with vestiges of another quite peculiar idiom[4]. The district between this and the Fayyûm has produced nothing, beyond of course examples of the eventually all-pervading Bohairic; but the Fayyûm itself gives us not merely the so-called 'Fayyûmic' of countless legal, commercial, and private documents, but also several varieties of this, each showing the results of northern Bohairic influence in differing degrees[5]. Finally, before the Delta is reached we have the dialect of Memphis, which, though found further north, shows less of the Bohairic taint than does the language of some Fayyûm texts.

The relationships of the Mid. Eg. dialects, as shown in their *literary* (biblical, liturgical, &c.) as well as their *documentary* (deeds, letters, &c.)

---

[1] Cf. Hyvernat *Album* p. 17, no. 50.

[2] Cf. *Recueil de Travaux* xxi 223 ff.

[3] e. g. a fragment of the Ep. of St. James in the British Museum, from Achmîm, written in a Sa'idic idiom, but retaining distinct Achmîmic features—features not wholly unknown even in some Sinuthian MSS.

[4] Cf. Krall in *Corp. Pap. Rain.* II, 99.

[5] e. g. nos. vii, xiii, xxxix in Crum, *l.c.*

remains, to their Sa'idic and Bohairic neighbours, are hard to state definitely. It appears to me clear, at any rate, that, as with the better known idioms, the language of the Mid. Egyptian literary texts has, for every-day usage, become more or less effete—especially as regards vocabulary. Its most characteristic words have been generally replaced by those corresponding in the greater dialects.

The question, too, as to the number of Mid. Eg. Bible versions is still unsettled; nor does our present text assist much in its solution. The only MS giving any of the same passages in a Mid. Eg. dialect, Cod. Borg. Basm., no. 2[1], presents a text identical, but for a few slight phonetic differences, with ours. A comparison, on the other hand, of our text with the Sa'idic and Bohairic versions[2] shows the balance of agreement somewhat in favour of the latter, both as regards vocabulary and syntax. While, for instance, the words ⲁⲙⲟⲓⲛⲓ, ⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ (*answer*), ϩⲱϯ, ϣⲉⲛⲉϣ, ϫⲓⲡⲏⲓ, and the forms ⲉⲗⲉⲧⲓⲛ (ⲉⲣⲁⲓⲧⲓⲛ) and other Greek verbs and nouns, ⲫϯ, ⲟ̅ⲥ̅, ⲉϣⲱⲡ, ⲧⲉⲓⲧ-, ⲛϫⲉ are distinctively Bohairic, scarcely any occur which could be claimed as peculiar to the Sa'idic.

Yet these are but dialectical peculiarities, and cannot be said to separate one version from the others. Test-passages, however, to indicate the relation of our version to either the Bohairic or the Sa'idic, are rare. The most important is in ch. iii 31, where it agrees with the Bohairic in adding the words 'who is above everything'; and in iv 17 the Coptic (though not the Greek) again agrees with the Bohairic in omitting 'to him'; but in several other passages (where the Sa'idic is not extant for comparison) the collation given below shows that it differs from the Bohairic. It would appear, therefore, not to agree wholly with either of the two major versions.

In most important points the Coptic text closely follows the readings of the parallel Greek text; as in iii 13 in omitting the addition, in iii 25 by reading 'Jew' *sing.*, in iii 27 by preserving the ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, in iii 34 in the reading ὁ θεός, in iv 9 by adding οὐ γὰρ συνχρῶνται, and in iv 23 the ἐν πνεύματι at the end. On the other hand, in iv 14 ἐγώ, and in iv 35 ἔτι, omitted in the Greek, are rendered by the Coptic; while in iv 17 αὐτῷ, inserted in the Greek, is absent from the Coptic.

The Mid. Eg. text is in many points interesting for itself, and shows the following unknown or rare forms:—

---

[1] Zoega, l. c., p. 149.

[2] What is available of the former version is to be found in Woide's *Appendix &c.*, 79 ff.; Tuki's *Rudimenta*, 183; Maspero's *Études*, I, 280 ff.; von Lemm's *Bruchstücke*, 20 ff.; *Aeg. Zeitschr.*, 1886, 104; Pleyte and Boeser's *Manuscrits coptes*, 74; Brit. Mus., MSS Or. 4717 (6), and Or. 3579 B (35). For the latter, Horner's (Clar. Press) edition of course suffices.

1. ⲉⲙⲉϣⲏⲓ[1]. In iii 5 this=Greek ἐὰν μή, Sa'id. ⲉⲩⲧⲙ-, Boh. ⲁⲩϣⲧⲉⲙ-; in iii 13 it has ⲉ- following and=Greek εἰ μή, Sa'id. ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲉⲓ, Boh. ⲉⲃⲏⲗ ⲉ-. I have not met with the word elsewhere. It is no doubt connected with the ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲉϣ in Zoega, *Catal.*, 609, n. 8 (vid. Erman, *Aeg. Z.*, xxxii 130).

2. ⲉϩⲟⲩⲁ ⲓⲥⲧⲉ-. In iii 19 this=Greek μᾶλλον . . . ἤ, Sa'id. ?, Boh. ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲧⲉ-. (In iv 1 it=Greek ἤ, Sa'id. ⲉϩⲟⲩⲉ-, Boh. ⲉϩⲟⲧⲉ.) It is a variant of ⲉϩⲟⲩⲁ ⲓⲥⲇⲉ, Zoega, l. c. 151, 154, 156[2].

3. ⲕⲉⲥ (and perhaps ⲕⲉⲉⲥ). In iii 16, 21, iv 8, 15 this = Sa'id. ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ or ⲉ-, Greek and Boh. ἵνα, ϩⲓⲛⲁ. The same form is found in a Mid. Eg. fragment of Romans xi in the British Museum.

4. ⲗⲁⲛϯ and ⲗⲁⲛⲥ. The first of these forms has not been before noticed. It occurs in iii 13, 27, 32, iv 27, where it = Greek οὐδείς or οὐδέν, Sa'id. ⲗⲁⲁⲩ, Boh. ϩⲗⲓ; while ⲗⲁⲛⲥ in iv 33 = Greek τις, Sa'id. and Boh. ⲟⲩⲁ, ⲟⲩⲁⲓ, though elsewhere (St. Matt. xiii 34, Mark viii 30, ix 8, 9[3]) it=οὐδείς, μηδείς, Sa'id. ⲗⲁⲁⲩ, Boh. ϩⲗⲓ. ⲗⲁⲛϯ is also found in a Berlin fragment, P. 5569, in St. John i 3, where it=Greek οὐδέν, Sa'id. ⲗⲁⲁⲩ, Boh. ϩⲗⲓ.

5. ϣⲉⲗⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ in iii 18=μονογενής. Sa'idic compounds of ϣⲏⲣⲉ omit the ⲣ(ⲗ).

6. ⲙⲁϣ in iv 16 is the imperative of ⲙⲁϣⲉ.

It remains for me to draw attention to some of the scribe's errors in the Coptic text.

In iii 18 ⲧⲁϥ for ⲛⲧⲁϥ, in iv 6 ⲛⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ for ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲏ, in iv 12 ⲛⲉⲥⲱ for ⲛⲉϥⲥⲱ, in iv 27 ⲙⲛⲛ perhaps for μέν, in iv 46 ⲉⲧⲁϥⲧⲉ- for ⲉⲧⲁϥⲧⲣⲉ-. Whether the peculiar forms ⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲓ 'Ιουδαῖος, ⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲁ, ϩⲓⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲁ 'Ιουδαία are to be regarded as errors may be doubted[4].

Of the more recently written text—in Coptic—it must for the present suffice to say that it is divided into two parts; the first consisting of arithmetical tables, somewhat similar to those in Baillet's Greek MS (*Méms. de la Miss. franç. au Caire*, IX), the second giving formulae referring to the calculation of various dry measures.

---

[1] The Sa'id. form would be *ⲉⲙⲉϣⲉ.

[2] This shows that Peyron's emendation, *Lex.* 341, was superfluous.

[3] *Méms. Inst. Égypt.*, II.

[4] In Rom. ii (fragm. in Brit. Mus.) the form ⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲓ occurs.

[Note on the Chapter-divisions in the Greek Text, pp. 422, 424, 430.

It will be noticed that the Greek text of the fragment here published has at three points, iii 19 iv 1 iv 45, chapter-headings: a word of explanation about them may be advantageous to prevent misconception. They do not in the MS occur continuously with the text, but are in each case at the top of a page (as in the Greek uncials A N Z), and refer therefore not necessarily to the exact verse at which they stand, but only to some verse on that page. The exigencies of printing prevented their being placed in the margin: but they have been distinguished by special type.

They correspond exactly to a system of *τίτλοι* or chapter-divisions which is found in some of the most ancient MSS of the Gospels, A C N R Z, all of the fifth or sixth century. According to this system St. Matthew has 68 chapters, St. Mark 48, St. Luke 83, St. John 18, as follows: *α′ περὶ τοῦ ἐν Κανᾷ γάμου, β′ περὶ τῶν ἐκβληθέντων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, γ′ περὶ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ Ἰησοῦ, δ′ περὶ καθαρισμοῦ ζήτησις, ε′ περὶ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος, ζ′ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ,* and so on. Some Coptic MSS (see Horner's edition I liv &c.) give this as an alternative system, under the title 'the great chapters': though in St. John by adding two titles at the end (after the Greek 18th) they raise the total to 20. Putting together the evidence of these Coptic MSS and of our sixth-century bilingual fragment with what is known or conjectured of the place of writing of some at least of the group A C N R Z, it certainly looks as if this chapter system had some connexion with Alexandria.]

III. 5. ΑΜΗΝ ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ϹΟΙ ΕΑΝ ΜΗ ΤΙϹ ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ ΕΞ ΥΔΑΤΟϹ ΚΑΙ
$\overline{\text{ΠΝϹ}}$ ΟΥ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΕΙϹΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΒΑϹΙΛΕΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΘΥ}}$ 6. ΤΟ
ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΚ ΤΗϹ ϹΑΡΚΟϹ ϹΑΡΞ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΚ
ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΠΝϹ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΠΝΑ}}$ ΕϹΤΙΝ 7. ΜΗ ΘΑΥΜΑϹΗϹ ΟΤΙ ΕΙΠΟΝ ϹΟΙ ΔΕΙ ΥΜΑϹ
ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΝΑΙ ΑΝΩΘΕΝ 8. ΤΟ $\overline{\text{ΠΝΑ}}$ ΟΠΟΥ ΘΕΛΕΙ ΠΝΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ
ΦΩΝΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΕΙϹ ΑΛΛ ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΑϹ ΠΟΘΕΝ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΥ
ΥΠΑΓΕΙ ΟΥΤΟϹ ΕϹΤΙ ΠΑϹ Ο ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΕΝΟϹ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΠΝϹ}}$ 9. [ΑΠ]Ε-
ΚΡΙΘΗ ΝΙ[ΚΟ]ΔΗΜΟϹ [ΚΑΙ Ε]ΙΠΕΝ ΑΥ[ΤΩ Π]ΩϹ ΔΥ[ΝΑΤΑΙ] ΤΑΥΤΑ [ΓΕΝ]ΕϹΘΑΙ
10. [ΑΠ]ΕΚΡΙ[ΘΗ Ο $\overline{\text{ΙϹ}}$] [ΚΑ]Ι ΕΙΠ[ΕΝ Α]Υ[ΤΩ] ϹΥ ΕΙ Ο ΔΙΔΑϹΚΑΛΟϹ ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΙΗΛ}}$
ΚΑΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΟΥ ΓΙΝΩϹΚΕΙϹ 11. ΑΜΗΝ ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ϹΟΙ ΟΤΙ Ο ΟΙΔΑΜΕΝ
ΛΑΛΟΥΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ Ο ΕΩΡΑΚΑΜΕΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΥΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑΝ ΗΜΩΝ
ΟΥ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΤΕ 12. ΕΙ ΤΑ ΕΠΙΓΕΙΑ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΠΙϹΤΕΥΕΤΕ
ΠΩϹ ΕΑΝ ΕΙΠΩ ΥΜΙΝ ΤΑ ΕΠΟΥΡΑΝΙΑ [ΠΙϹΤΕΥ]ΕΤΕ 13. [ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔ]ΕΙϹ
ΑΝΑΒ[ΕΒΗ]ΚΕΝ ΕΙϹ Τ[ΟΝ Ο]ΥΡΑΝΟΝ Ε[Ι] ΜΗ Ο ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑϹ
Ο $\overline{\text{ΥϹ}}$ ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΑΝΟΥ}}$ 14. ΚΑΙ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΜΩΥϹΗϹ ΥΨΩϹΕ¯ ΤΟΝ ΟΦΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ
ΕΡΗΜΩ· ΟΥΤΩϹ ΥΨΩΘΗΝΑΙ ΔΕΙ ΤΟ¯ $\overline{\text{ΥΝ}}$ ΤΟΥ $\overline{\text{ΑΝΟΥ}}$ 15. ΙΝΑ ΠΑϹ
Ο ΠΙϹΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙϹ ΑΥΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΧΗ ΖΩΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ

16. ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΗΓΑΠΗϹΕΝ Ο $\overline{\text{ΘϹ}}$ ΤΟ¯ ΚΟϹΜΟΝ ΩϹΤΕ ΤΟΝ $\overline{\text{ΥΝ}}$ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΤΟΝ ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗ ΕΔΩΚΕ¯ ΕΙΝΑ ΠΑϹ Ο ΠΙϹΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΜΗ ΑΠΟΛΗΤΑΙ
ΑΛΛ ΕΧΗ ΖΩΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ 17. ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΑΠΕϹΤΕΙΛΕΝ Ο $\overline{\text{ΘϹ}}$ ΤΟΝ $\overline{\text{ΥΝ}}$

A collation of the Greek text, using Tischendorf's *apparatus criticus* with some corrections, gives the following results. The reading of the MS occupies the first place in each instance.

iii 5. *τοῦ θεοῦ*: so ℵ^{c}ABLΓΔΛΠ and nearly all other authorities; *τῶν οὐρανῶν* ℵ* 511, Evst. 26, al. pauc., *e m*, and some patristic quotations.

6. *σάρξ ἐστιν*: so most authorities; 161, most Old Latin MSS and Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$ add *quia de carne natum est.* Similarly after *πνεῦμά ἐστιν* the same authorities add *quia deus spiritus est.* Syr.$^{\text{sin.}}$ adds only the second clause.

8. *καὶ ποῦ*: so ℵBL and most authorities; *ἢ ποῦ* A, 511, most Old Lat. *ουτος*: so MS, for *οὕτως*. *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος*: so most authorities; *ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος* ℵ, many Old Lat. (*a b e ff*^{2} *m*), Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin.}}$

10. *ὁ* Ἰησοῦς ℵ 69, and a few other cursives; Ἰησοῦς ABL &c. The MS reading is uncertain, but there are some indications that it had *ὁ*.

12. *οὐ πιστεύετε*: so most authorities, including Sah.; *οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε* EH, a few cursives, Boh., Syr.$^{\text{pal.}}$ *πιστεύετε*: so T^{b} Λ *b ff*^{2} *l*, Boh., Sah.; *πιστεύσετε* ℵABEL &c.; *πιστεύσητε* GHKMΓΔ^{2}Π 1, 22, 28, 69, 124.

13. *ἀνθρώπου*: so, without addition, ℵBLT^{b} 33, Sah.; + *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* AΓΔΛΠ &c., Old Lat., Vulg., Syr. omn., Arm. The Bohairic MSS are very evenly divided.

14. *Μωυσῆς*: so ℵBKLST^{b} 33 &c.; *Μωσῆς* AEGHMUVΓΔΛ &c.

15. *εἰς αὐτόν*: so ℵΓΔΛΠ &c., most Old Lat.; *ἐν αὐτῷ* BT^{b}, best Vulg. MSS; *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* L; *ἐπ' αὐτόν* A. *αυαυτον*: so MS, by dittography. *ἔχῃ*: so ℵBLT^{b} 1, 22, 33, 118, 124, 161, 209, *a f*, Syr.$^{\text{cur. pal.}}$, Boh., Sah.; *ἔχει* EFHMS; *μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ* AΓΔΛΠ &c., *b c e ff*^{2} *g l q*, Vulg., Syr.$^{\text{sin. pesh. hark.}}$

16. *αὐτοῦ*: so ℵ^{c}ALT^{b} and nearly all authorities; om. ℵ*B. *εἰς αὐτόν*: so most authorities; *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* L; *ἐπ' αὐτόν* T^{b}. *ἔχῃ*: so the older uncials and Text. Rec.; *ἔχει* EFHMΓΛ &c.

III. 5. ϫⲉϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲉⲕ ϫⲉⲉⲙⲉϣⲏⲓ
ⲛⲥⲉϫⲡⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁⲩ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲙⲙⲛϣϭⲁⲙ
ⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲧⲣⲣⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ϯ̅·
6. ⲡⲓϫⲡⲁ ⲉⲃⲁ[ⲗ ϩ̅]ⲛⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲟⲩⲥⲁ[ⲣⲝ]ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲓϫⲡⲁ
ⲉⲃⲁⲗ [ϩⲛ]ⲡⲉⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ [ⲟⲩ]ⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ⲡⲉ 7. ⲙⲡⲉ[ⲗ]ⲉ[ⲗⲙⲁⲓ]ϩⲓ
ϫⲉ[ⲁⲓϫⲁⲥ ⲛⲉ̅ⲕ] ϫⲉϩⲱ[ϯⲡⲉ ⲛⲥⲉ]ϫⲡⲉⲧⲏⲛⲟ[ⲩ] ⲛⲕⲉⲥⲁⲛ
8. ⲡⲉⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ϣⲁϥⲛⲓϥⲓ ⲉⲡⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲉϩⲛⲉϥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲙⲏ
ϣⲁⲕⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲉⲗⲁⲥ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲕⲥⲁⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛ ϫⲉⲁϥⲛⲏⲟⲩ
ⲉⲃⲁⲗ $\overset{?}{\text{ⲧ̅}}$ⲱ̅· $\overset{\text{sic}}{\text{ⲓ}}$ ⲁϥⲛⲉϣ$\overset{?}{\text{ⲏ}}$ [ⲉⲧⲱⲛ] ⲧⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲧϩ[ⲏ ⲛⲟⲩ]ⲁⲛ
ⲛⲓⲃⲓ $\overset{?}{\text{ⲉ}}$[ⲧⲟⲩ]ϫⲡⲁϥ ⲉ[ⲃⲁⲗ] ϩⲙⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ 9. ⲁϥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ
ⲛϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲉϥ ⲛⲉϥ· ϫⲉⲡⲱⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲛϣϭⲁⲙ
ⲛⲧⲉⲛⲉⲓ ϣⲱⲡⲓ 10. ⲁϥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲉϥ ⲛⲉϥ·
ϫⲉⲛⲧ[ⲁ]ⲕⲡⲉ ⲛⲥⲉϩ [ⲙⲡⲓ̅ⲥ̅]ⲣ̅ⲗ̅ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ[ⲏⲓ ⲁ]ⲕⲥⲁⲟⲩⲛ
ⲙⲙ[ⲁ]ⲩ ⲉⲛ 11. ϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϩⲁⲙ[ⲏ]ⲛ ϯϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ
[ⲛⲉⲕ] ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲁⲟ[ⲩⲛ] ⲙⲙⲁϥ· ⲧⲉⲛϣⲉϫ[ⲓ] ⲙⲙⲁϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧ[ⲉⲛ]ⲛⲉⲩ ⲉⲗⲁϥ· ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲡ[ⲉ]ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲗⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ
ⲙⲙⲁϥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲛⲙⲉⲧⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ
ⲉⲛ· 12. ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲡⲕⲉϩⲓ ⲁⲓϫⲁⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ·
ⲡⲱⲥ ⲁⲓϣⲁⲛϫⲉⲛⲁⲧⲡⲏ ⲛ[ⲉ]ⲧⲉⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛ·
13. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲗⲁⲛϯ ϣⲏ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ
ⲉⲧⲡⲏ· ⲉⲙⲉϣⲏⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲓ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲧⲡⲏ ⲡϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲙⲡⲗⲱⲙⲓ·
14. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧϩⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ ϫⲓⲥⲓ
ⲙⲡⲓϩⲁϥ ϩⲓⲧⲉⲣⲏⲙⲟⲥ· ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲏ ϩⲱϯ ⲛⲥⲉϫⲓⲥⲓ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲗⲓ
ⲙⲡⲗⲱⲙⲓ· 15. ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ
ⲉⲗⲁϥ· ⲛϥϫⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲛϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ·

16. ⲧⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣⲧⲉ ⲧϩⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲫ̅ϯ̅ ⲙⲉⲗⲗⲓ ⲛⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ
ⲙⲙⲁⲥ· ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲡⲉϥϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲡⲉϥⲙⲟⲛⲟⲅⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲁϥⲧⲉⲓϥ·
ⲕⲉⲉ[ⲥ ⲟ]ⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲃ[ⲓ ⲉⲧ]ⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ [ⲉⲗ]ⲁϥ ⲛϥϣⲧⲉ[ⲙ]ⲧⲁⲕⲁ
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛϥ[ϫⲓ] ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲛϣⲁ[ⲉ]ⲛⲉϩ· 17.
ⲛⲡⲁⲫ̅ϯ̅ ⲅ[ⲁⲣ] ⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲟⲩⲁ ⲙⲡⲉϥϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲉⲛ[ⲕⲟ]ⲥⲙⲟⲥ·

ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΙϹ ΤΟΝ ΚΟϹΜΟ¯ ΙΝΑ ΚΡΙΝΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΚΟϹΜΟΝ ΑΛΛ ΙΝΑ ϹΩΘΗ Ο ΚΟϹΜΟϹ
ΔΙ ΑΥ[Τ]ΟΥ 18. Ο ΠΙϹΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΟΥ ΚΡΙΝΕΤΑΙ· Ο ΔΕ ΜΗ
ΠΙϹΤΕΥΩΝ ΗΔΗ ΚΕΚΡΙΤΑΙ ΟΤΙ ΟΥ ΜΗ ΠΕΠΙϹΤΕΥ[ΚΕΝ] ΕΙϹ ΤΟ ΟΝ[ΟΜΑ ΤΟ]Υ
ΜΟΝΟ[ΓΕΝΟΥϹ] Υ̅Υ̅ ΤΟΥ [Θ̅Υ̅] 19. ΑΥΤΗ ΔΕ ΕϹΤΙ Η ΚΡΙϹΙϹ ΟΤΙ ΤΟ
ΦΩϹ ΕΛΗΛΥΘΕΝ ΕΙϹ Τ[ΟΝ] ΚΟϹΜΟΝ [ΚΑΙ ΗΓ]ΑΠΗϹΑ¯ [ΟΙ Α̅Ν̅]Ο̅Ι̅ ΜΑΛ[ΛΟΝ ΤΟ]
ϹΚΟ[ΤΟϹ Η Τ]Ο ΦΩϹ [ΗΝ ΓΑΡ Α]ΥΤΩ¯ [ΠΟΝΗΡΑ ΤΑ ΕΡΓΑ] **Δ̅· ΖΗΤΗΣΙΣ
ΠΕΡΙ ΚΑΘΑΡΙΣΜΟΥ:** 20. ΠΑϹ ΓΑΡ Ο ΦΑΥΛΑ ΠΡΑϹϹΩΝ ΜΙϹΕΙ ΤΟ
ΦΩϹ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΠΡΟϹ ΤΩ ΦΩϹ ΙΝΑ ΜΗ ΕΛΕΓΧΘΗ ΤΑ ΕΡΓΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ
21. Ο ΔΕ ΠΟΙΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ¯ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΠΡΟϹ ΤΟ ΦΩϹ ΙΝΑ ΦΑΝΕΡΩΘΗ
ΤΑ ΕΡΓΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΤΙ ΕΝ Θ̅Ω̅ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΕΙΡΓΑϹΜΕΝΑ

22. ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΗΛΘΕΝ Ο Ι̅Ϲ̅ Κ[ΑΙ] ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ [ΑΥ]Τ[ΟΥ] [ΕΙϹ] ΤΗΝ
ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΝ ΓΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΕΙ ΔΙΕΤΡΙΒΕΝ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΩ¯ ΚΑΙ ΕΒΑΠΤΙΖΕ¯ 23. ΗΝ
ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΙΩΑΝΝΗϹ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΙΝΩ¯ ΕΓΓΥϹ ΤΟΥ ϹΑ[ΛΕΙ]Μ· ΟΤΙ ΥΔΑ[ΤΑ]
ΠΟΛΛΑ [ΗΝ] ΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙ [ΠΑ]ΡΕΓΙΝΟΝΤΟ [Κ]ΑΙ ΕΒΑΠΤΙΖΟ¯[Τ]Ο 24. ΟΠΟΥ
ΓΑΡ [ΗΝ] ΒΕΒΛΗΜΕΝΟϹ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ [Φ]Υ[Λ]ΑΚΗΝ Ο [Ι]ΩΑΝΝΗϹ

25. ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΝ ΖΗΤΗϹΙϹ ΕΚ ΤΩ¯ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΥ
ΠΕΡΙ ΚΑΘΑΡΙϹΜΟΥ 26. ΚΑΙ ΗΛΘΟΝ ΠΡΟϹ ΤΟ¯ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΟΝ
ΑΥΤΩ ΡΑΒΒΕΙ ΟϹ ΗΝ ΜΕΤΑ ϹΟΥ Π[Ε]ΡΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΙΟΡΔΑΝΟΥ Ω ϹΥ ΜΕΜΑΡΤΥ-
ΡΗΚΑϹ ΙΔΟΥ ΟΥΤΟ[Ϲ] ΒΑΠΤΙΖΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΕϹ ΕΡΧΟ[Ν]ΤΑΙ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥ[Τ]ΟΝ
27. ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ ΙΩ[Α]ΝΝΗϹ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΥ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ Α̅Ν̅Ο̅Ϲ̅ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ ΑΦ
ΕΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΥΔΕΝ ΕΑΝ ΜΗ Η ΔΕΔΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΑΥΤ[Ω ΕΚ ΤΟΥ] ΟΥ[ΡΑΝΟΥ

---

17. *αὐτοῦ*: so ΑΓΔΛΠ, Old Lat., Vulg., &c.: om. ℵBLT^{b} 1, 22, 118, 209, 262, Sah. *κρίνει*: so MS, for *κρίνῃ*.

18. *ὁ δὲ μή*: so ALT^{b}ΓΔΛΠ &c., Old Lat., Vulg., &c.: *δέ* om. ℵB *ff*^{2} *l.* *οὐ μή*: *μή* alone all authorities.

19. *οἱ . . . σκότος*: so generally; *οἱ ἀ. ἠγάπησαν τὸ σκότος μᾶλλον* ℵ. *αὐτῶν πονηρά*: so ℵABGKLT^{b}UΛΠ; *πονηρὰ αὐτῶν* EFHMSVΓΔ.

20. *τω*: so MS, for *τό*. *τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*: so ℵBLT^{b}ΓΔΛ &c.; *αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα* AKΠ; + *ὅτι πονηρά ἐστιν* LΔ 13, 33, Boh.

21. *τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*: so LU 33, 69, most Old Lat.; *αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα* ℵ^{c} (ℵ* om. the passage by error) ABT^{b} &c.

23. *Ἰωάννης*: so generally; *ὁ Ἰωάνης* B.

24. *οπου*: so MS, for *οὔπω*. *ὁ Ἰωάννης*: so ℵ^{c}ALΓΔΛΠ &c.; *ὁ* om. ℵ*B Evst. 47.

25. *οὖν*: so generally; *δέ* ℵ* 47, Boh., Syr.$^{cur.}$ *ζήτησις*: so generally; *συνζήτησις* ℵ* (probably from *οὖν ζήτησις*). *Ἰωάννου*: so generally; *τῶν Ἰωάνου* B. *Ἰουδαίου*: so ℵ^{c}ABLΓΔΛ*Π*, Syr.$^{sin.}$; *Ἰουδαίων* ℵ*GΛ^{2}Π^{2}, the Ferrar group, Old Lat., Vulg., Syr.$^{cur.}$, Boh.

26. *ἦλθον . . . εἶπον*: so generally; *ἦλθαν . . . εἶπαν* B*. *ἰδού*: so D 1, 209; *ἴδε* generally.

27. *ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ*: so LΛ, the Ferrar group, Syr. $^{pesh.\ hark.\ pal.}$, Boh.; om. generally *αὐτῷ*: the Ferrar group adds *ἄνωθεν*.

$\overset{?}{\text{ⲕ}}$[ⲉⲥ ⲛϥϯ]ϩⲉⲡ ⲉⲡ[ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ] ⲁⲗⲗ[ⲁ ⲕⲉⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ]ⲡⲕⲟ[ⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁ]ϩ[ⲉⲙ].

[2 lines lost.]

ⲛⲥⲉⲛⲉϯϩⲉⲡ ⲉⲗⲁϥ ⲉⲛ· ⲡⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϥ ⲉⲧⲉⲛϥⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲉⲗⲁϥ ⲉⲛ· ϩⲏⲇⲏ ⲁⲩϯϩⲉⲡ ⲉⲗⲁϥ· ϫⲉⲙⲡⲉϥⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲉⲡⲗⲉⲛ ⲙⲡϣⲉⲗⲡⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲫ̄ϯ· 19. ⲡⲉⲓ ⲇⲉⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲉⲡ ϫⲉⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛ· ⲁϥⲓ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲓⲗⲱⲙⲓ ⲁⲩⲙⲉⲗⲗⲓ ⲧⲕⲉⲙⲧⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲁ ⲓⲥⲧⲉⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛ· ϫⲉⲛⲉⲩϩⲃⲏⲟ[ⲩⲓ] ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁ$\overset{?}{\text{ⲩ}}$[ϩ]ⲁⲩⲡⲉ· 20. ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲅ[ⲁⲣ] ⲉⲧⲉⲗϩⲱⲃ ⲉϥϩⲁⲩ ϥⲙⲁⲥϯ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ$\overset{?}{\text{ⲙ}}$ⲉϥⲓ ϣⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛ· ⲕⲉⲥ ϫⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁϩⲉ ⲛⲉϥϩⲃⲏⲟⲩⲓ· 21. ⲡⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲉⲧⲓⲗⲓ ⲛⲧ[ⲙⲉⲓ] ϣⲁϥⲓ ϣⲁ[ⲡⲟⲩⲁ]ⲓⲛ· ⲕⲉⲥ ⲛ[ⲧⲉ]ⲛⲉϥϩⲃⲏ[ⲟⲩⲓ] ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃ[ⲁⲗ] ϫⲉⲁϥⲉⲓⲧⲟ[ⲩ] ϩⲙⲫ̄ϯ·

22. ⲙⲉⲛⲛⲥⲁⲛⲉ[ⲓ] ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲓ ⲛϫ[ⲉ] ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙⲛⲛ[ⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ] ⲉⲡⲕⲉϩⲓ ⲛⲧⲉ ϯⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲁ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲙⲙⲉⲩ ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁϥϯϫⲱⲕⲉⲙⲡⲉ· 23. ⲛⲁⲗⲉⲡⲕⲉⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱϥ ⲛⲁϥϯϫⲱⲕⲉⲙⲡⲉ ϩⲛⲉⲛⲱ̅ ϩⲁⲧⲉⲥⲁⲗⲓⲙ· ϫⲉⲛⲉⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁⲧⲁ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲙⲙⲉⲩⲡⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ[ⲛ]ⲏⲟⲩ ϣⲁⲗⲁϥ ⲉⲩϫⲓϫⲱⲕⲉⲙ· 24. ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩϩⲓⲟⲩⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ [ⲉ]ⲡⲉϣⲧⲉⲕⲁ

25. ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲍⲏⲧⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ ⲙ$\overset{\text{sic}}{\text{ⲛ̄}}$ⲟⲩⲓⲇ[ⲉⲓ] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ[ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲃⲁ· 26. ⲁ]ⲩⲱ [ⲁⲩ$\overset{?}{\text{ⲓ}}$ ϣⲁⲓ]ⲱⲁⲛ[ⲛⲏⲥ ⲡ]ⲉϫⲉⲩ ⲛ[ⲉϥ] ϫⲉⲣⲁⲃⲃⲓ ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲁϥ $\overset{?}{\text{ⲛ}}\overset{?}{\text{ⲉ}}\overset{?}{\text{ⲙ}}$ⲉⲕ ϩⲓⲡⲓⲉ$\overset{?}{\text{ⲕ}}$[ⲣⲁⲁⲩ[1]] $\overset{?}{\text{ⲙ}}\overset{?}{\text{ⲡ}}$ⲓⲟⲣⲇⲁⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲕⲉ[ⲗ]ⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ [2 or 3 let.] ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧϥ [ⲓⲥ ϥϯ]ϫⲱⲕⲉⲙ [ⲁⲩⲱ] ⲥⲉⲛⲏⲟⲩ [ϣⲁⲗⲁϥ] ⲧⲏⲗⲟⲩ· 27. ⲁ[ϥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ] ⲛϫ[ⲉ ⲓ]ⲱⲁ[ⲛⲛⲏⲥ] ϫⲉⲙⲙⲛϣϭⲁⲙ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲗⲱⲙⲓ ϫⲓⲗⲁⲡϯ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲁⲧϥ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲧϥ· ⲁⲩϣⲧⲉⲙⲧⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲉϥ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ

---

[1] So in Matt. xiii 48 (Bouriant).

28. ΑΥΤ]ΟΙ ΥΜΕΙ[Ϲ ΜΟΙ] ΜΑΡΤΥ[ΡΕΙ]ΤΕ ΟΤΙ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΙΜΕΙ Ο Χ̅Ϲ̅ ΑΛΛ ΟΤΙ
Α[Π]ΕϹΤΑΛΜΕ[ΝΟϹ] ΕΙΜΙ ΕΜ[ΠΡΟ]ϹΘΕΝ [ΕΚΕΙ]ΝΟΥ· 29. [Ο ΕΧ]ΩΝ ΤΗΝ
[ΝΥ]ΜΦΗΝ ΝΥΜ[ΦΙΟ]Ϲ ΕϹ[ΤΙΝ] Ο ΔΕ ΦΙΛΟϹ ΤΟΥ ΝΥΜΦΙΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ Ο ΕϹΤΗΚΩϹ
ΚΑΙ ΑΚΟΥΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΧΑΡΑ ΧΑΙΡΕΙ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΦΩΝΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΝΥΜΦΙΟΥ· ΑΥΤΗ
ΟΥ¯ Η ΧΑΡΑ Η ΕΜΗ ΠΕΠΛΗΡΩΤΑΙ· 30. ΕΚΕΙΝΟΝ ΔΕΙ ΑΥΞΑΝΕΙΝ ΕΜΕ ΔΕ
ΕΛΑΤΤΟΥϹΘΑΙ

31. Ο ΑΝΩΘΕΝ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟϹ ΕΠΑΝΩ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕϹΤΙΝ Ο [ΩΝ ΕΚ ΤΗ]Ϲ
ΓΗ[Ϲ] [ΕΚ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ Ε]ϹΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΚ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ ΛΑΛΕΙ Ο ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΝ̅Ο̅Υ̅
ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟϹ ΕΠΑΝΩ ΠΑΝΤΩ¯ ΕϹΤΙΝ 32. Ο ΕΩΡΑΚΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΚΟΥϹΕΝ
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΥΔΕΙϹ ΛΑΜ[ΒΑ]ΝΕΙ·
33. Ο ΛΑΒΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ [ΤΗ]Ν ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑ¯ [ΕϹ]ΦΡΑΓΙ[ϹΕΝ] ΟΤΙ Ο Θ̅Ϲ̅ [ΑΛΗΘ]ΗϹ
ΕϹΤΙ 34. [ΟΝ ΓΑ]Ρ ΑΠΕϹ[ΤΕ]ΙΛΕ[Ν Ο Θ̅Ϲ̅] ΤΑ ΡΗΜΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ Θ̅Υ̅ ΛΑΛΕΙ
ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΕΚ ΜΕΤΡΟΥ ΔΙΔΩϹΙΝ Ο Θ̅Ϲ̅ ΤΟ Π̅Ν̅Α̅· 35. Ο Π̅Η̅Ρ̅ ΑΓΑΠΑ ΤΟΝ
Υ̅Ν̅ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΔΕΔΩΚΕΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΧΕΙΡΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ 36. Ο ΠΙϹΤΕΥΩ¯ ΕΙϹ
ΤΟΝ Υ̅Ν̅ ΕΧΕΙ ΖΩΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ· Ο ΔΕ ΑΠΕΙΘΩΝ ΤΩ Υ̅Ω̅ ΟΥΚ ΟΨΕΤΑΙ
ΖΩΗΝ ΑΛΛ Η ΟΡΓΗ ΤΟΥ Θ̅Υ̅ ΜΕΝΕΙ ΕΠ ΑΥΤΟ¯

IV. 1. ΩϹ ΟΥΝ ΕΓΝΩ Ο Ι̅Ϲ̅ [**Ε̅. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΣΑ**]**ΜΑΡΙΤΙ**[**ΔΟΣ.**] [ΟΤ]Ι ΗΚΟΥϹΑ¯
[ΟΙ ΦΑ]ΡΙϹΑΙΟΙ [ΟΤΙ] Ι̅Ϲ̅ ΠΛΕΙΟ[ΝΑ]Ϲ ΜΑΘΗΤΑϹ [Π]ΟΙΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΕΙ Η
ΙΩΑ¯ΝΗϹ 2. ΚΑΙΤΟΙΓΕ Ι̅Ϲ̅ ΑΥΤΟϹ ΟΥΚ ΕΒΑΠΤΙΖΕΝ· ΑΛΛ᾽ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ
ΑΥΤΟΥ· 3. ΑΦΗΚΕΝ ΤΗΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΝ· ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ
ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΝ

28. *μοί*: so ABDGKLT^{b} &c.; om. ℵEFHMVΓ. *εἶπον*: so generally; *εἶπον ἐγώ* B; *ἐγὼ εἶπον* T$^{b\ \text{vid.}}$, Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$ *οὐκ εἰμί*: so D *a l*, Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$; *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ* ℵABLT^{b} &c.

29. *ἐστίν* after *νυμφίου*: so MS, by scribe's mistake. *αὐτοῦ*: so generally; ℵ places after *ἑστηκώς*.

31. *ὁ ὢν ἐκ*: so generally; *ὁ δὲ ὢν ἐπί* ℵ*D. *ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν*: so ℵ^{c}ABLT^{b} ΔΛΠ, *c f g q*, Vulg., Syr.$^{\text{pesh. hark. pal.}}$, Boh.; om. ℵD 1, 22, 118, *a b e ff*^{2} *l*, Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$

32. *ὅ*: so ℵBDLT^{b} 1, 22, 33, 118, 209, *a b e l*, Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$, Boh.; *καὶ ὅ* ΑΓΔΛΠ, *c f ff*^{2} *g q*, Vulg., Syr.$^{\text{pesh. hark.}}$ *τοῦτο*: so ABLT^{b} &c.; om. ℵD 1, 22, 28, 118, *a b e ff*^{2} *l*, Boh., Syr.$^{\text{cur. pesh.}}$

34. *δίδωσιν ὁ θεός*: so AC^{2}DΓΔΛΠ, most Old Lat., Vulg., Syr., Boh.; *ὁ θεός* om. ℵBC*LT^{b} 1, 33, *b e f l*.

35. *δέδωκεν*: so generally; *ἔδωκεν* DK. *χειρει*: so MS, for *χειρί*.

36. *ὁ . . . ἔχει*: so generally; *ἵνα ὁ . . . ἔχῃ* D. *ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν*: so ℵ^{c}ABCDLT^{b} &c.; *δέ* om. ℵ* *a e ff*^{2} *l*. *ζωήν*: so ℵABCDT^{b} &c.; *τὴν ζωήν* EFHLM &c. *μένει ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν*: so generally; *ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν μένει* ℵ *b*.

iv 1. *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*: so ℵDΛ 1, 22, 118, 209, *a b c e ff*^{2} *l*, Vulg., Syr.$^{\text{cur. pesh.}}$, Boh.; *ὁ κύριος*, ABCLT^{b} &c., *f q*, Syr.$^{\text{sin.}}$ *ἤ*: so generally; om. AB*GLΓ.

3. *Ἰουδαίαν*: so generally; + *γῆν* D 1, 13, 69, 106, 124, *a b e ff*^{2} *l*. *πάλιν*: so ℵB^{2}CDLMT^{b} 1, 33, 69, 124, 346, *a b c e f ff*^{2} *l*, Vulg., Boh., Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin. pesh.}}$; om. AB*ΓΔΛΠ &c., Syr.$^{\text{hark.}}$

ϩⲛⲧⲡⲏ· 28. ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲗⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ ⲛⲏⲓ
ϫⲉⲁⲓϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲛⲡⲉ ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ
ϩⲁϫⲱϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ· 29. ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲧϣⲉⲗⲏⲏⲧ
ⲛⲧⲁⲧϥ· ⲛⲧⲁϥⲡⲉ ⲡ[ⲡⲁ]ⲧϣⲉⲗⲏⲏⲧ ⲡⲉϣⲃⲏⲗ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ
sic ⲛⲛ̈ⲡⲁⲧϣⲉⲗⲏⲏⲧ· ⲡⲉⲧⲟϩⲓ ⲉⲗⲉⲧϥ ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲉⲗⲁϥ·
ϩⲛⲟⲩⲗⲉϣⲓ ϣⲁϥⲗⲉϣⲓ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲧϣⲉ-
ⲗⲏⲏⲧ· ⲡⲉⲓ ⲟ̅ⲩ̅ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲗⲉϣⲓ ⲁϥϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ 30. ϩⲱϯ
ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲉ[ⲓ] ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ ϫ[ⲓ]ⲥⲓ· ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲑ[ⲉ]ⲃⲓ[ⲁ]

31. ⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲓ ⲉ[ⲃⲁⲗ] ϩⲙⲡϫⲓ[ⲥⲓ ϥϩⲓ]ϫⲉⲛⲟⲩ[ⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ]
ⲡ[ⲓⲉ]ⲃⲁⲗ ⲇ[ⲉ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲉ]ϩⲓ ⲟⲩ[ⲉⲃⲁⲗ] ϩ[ⲙⲡⲕⲉϩⲓⲡⲉ]
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϣⲉϫⲓ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲉϩⲓ· ⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲓ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲙⲡ-
ϫⲓⲥⲓ· ϥⲥⲁⲛϫⲓⲥⲓ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲧⲏⲗⲟⲩ· 32. ⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲛⲉⲩ
ⲉⲗⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲥⲁⲧⲙⲉϥ· ⲡⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲧ[ⲉⲗ]ⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ
ⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉϥ[ⲙⲉⲧ]ⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ· [ⲙⲙⲁⲛ] ⲗⲁⲛϯ ϫⲓ
ⲙⲙⲁⲥ· 33. ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲁϥϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲉϥⲙⲉⲧⲙⲉⲧⲣⲏ ⲁϥⲉⲗ-
ⲥⲫⲣⲁⲅⲓⲍⲓ̄ ⲙⲙⲁϥ ϫⲉⲫ̅ϯ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲓⲡⲉ 34. ⲡ[ⲏ] ⲅⲁⲣ
ⲉⲧⲁⲫ̅ϯ ⲧⲁ[ⲩⲁϥ] ⲛⲛϣⲉϫⲓ ⲛ[ⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ϯ] ⲡⲉⲧϥϣⲉϫⲓ
[ⲙⲙⲁⲩ] ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛⲟⲩϣ[ⲓ] ⲉⲛ ϣⲁⲗⲉⲫ̅ϯ ϯ ⲙⲡⲉⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅·
35. ⲡ?ⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲏⲓ ⲙⲡϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ?ϩ[ⲱⲃ] ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲁϥⲧⲉⲓⲧⲟⲩ
ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲛⲉϥϭ[ⲓϫ] 36. ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲡϣⲏⲗⲓ
ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲧⲉϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲛϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲡⲏⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲉⲧ[ⲉ]ϥ-
ⲛⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲉⲡϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲉⲛ· ⲛⲛⲉϥⲛⲉⲩ ⲉⲡⲱⲛϩ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
ⲟⲩϭⲱⲛⲧ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ϯ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲉϣⲱⲡⲓ ϩⲓϫⲱϥ·

IV. 1. ⲉⲧⲁϥⲓⲙⲓ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉⲁⲩⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲛϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲫⲁ-
ⲣⲓⲥⲉⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲁⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲕⲱ ⲛⲉϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲧⲁ ⲙⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ
ϫⲉϥϯϫⲱⲕⲉⲙ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲁ ⲓⲥⲧⲉⲓⲱⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ 2. ⲕⲉⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ
ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲉⲛ ⲛⲁϥϯϫⲱⲕⲉⲙ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ·
3. ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲁϥⲕⲱ ⲛⲧϩⲓⲟⲩⲇⲉⲁ ⲛⲥⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲁⲛ

4. εδει δε αυτο̅ διερχεϲθαι δια τηϲ ϲαμαρειαϲ 5. ερχεται
ουν ειϲ πολιν τηϲ ϲαμαρειαϲ λεγομενην ϲυχαρ πληϲιο̅ του
χωριου ου εδωκεν ιακωβ ιωϲηφ τω υ̅ω̅ αυτου· 6. ην δε
εκει πηγη του ιακωβ· ο ουν ι̅ϲ̅ καικο̅πιακωϲ εκ τηϲ οδοιποριαϲ
εκαθιϲεν ουτωϲ επι τη πηγη· ωρα ην ωϲ εκτη· 7. ερχεται
γ[υ]νη εκ τηϲ ϲαμαρειαϲ αντληϲαι υδωρ· λεγει αυτη ο ι̅ϲ̅ δοϲ μοι
πιειν 8. οι γαρ μαθηται αυτου απεληλυθειϲαν ειϲ την πολιν ινα
τροφαϲ αγοραϲωϲι̅· 9. λεγει ουν αυτω η γυνη η ϲαμαρειτιϲ πωϲ
ϲυ ιουδαιοϲ ων πα[ρ εμου] πειν [αιτ]ειϲ γυναι[κ]οϲ ϲαμαρι[τιδ]οϲ
ουϲηϲ· ου γαρ ϲυνχρω̅ται ιουδαιοι ϲαμαριταιϲ· 10. απεκριθη ι̅ϲ̅
και ειπεν αυτη η ειδειϲ την δωρεαν του θ̅υ̅ και τιϲ εϲτιν ο λεγων
ϲοι δοϲ μοι πιειν· ϲυ αν ητηϲαϲ αυτο̅· και εδωκεν αν ϲοι υδωρ ζων·
11. λεγει αυτω η γυνη· κ̅ε̅ ουτε αντλημα εχειϲ· και τ[ο] φρεαρ
εϲ[τι̅] [β]αθυ· ποθεν ουν εχειϲ το υδωρ το ζων· 12. μη ϲυ
μειζων ει του π̅ρ̅ϲ̅ ημων ιακωβ οϲτιϲ εδωκεν η[μι]ν το φρεαρ [και]
αυτοϲ εξ αυτου επιεν και οι [υ]ιοι αυτου· κα[ι τ]α θρεμα[τα αυ]του·
13. [απεκ]ριθη ο ι̅ϲ̅ [και ει]πεν αυ[τη πα]ϲ ο πι[νω]ν εκ του [υδα]τοϲ
του[του] διψ[ηϲει] [παλι]ν 14. οϲ δ αν πιη εκ του υδατοϲ ου
εγω δωϲω αυτω ου μη διψηϲη ειϲ τον αιωνα αλλα το υδωρ ο δωϲω
αυτω [γε]νηϲεται εν αυτω πηγη υδατοϲ [αλλο]μενου [ειϲ ζω]ην

4. *Σαμαρείας*: so ABE^{2}FGHK &c.; *Σαμαρίας* ℵCDE*LΓΔ. Similarly where the word occurs elsewhere.

5. *οὗ*: so C*DLMS 1, 28, 33, 157, 209; *ὃ* ℵABC^{2}T^{b}ΓΔΛΠ &c. *Ἰωσήφ*: so generally; *τῷ Ἰωσήφ* ℵB.

6. *καικο—|πιακως*: so MS, for *κεκοπιακώς*, by a common mis-spelling. *ἐκάθισεν*: so this MS alone; *ἐκαθέζετο* all other authorities. *ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ*: so generally; *ἐπὶ τὴν πηγήν* L.

7. *γυνή*: so generally; *τις γυνή* ℵ *b*, Boh., Sah. *πιεῖν*: so ℵ^{c}AB^{3}C^{3}ΓΔΛΠ &c.; *πεῖν* ℵ*B*C*DL.

8. *ἀπεληλύθεισαν*: so generally; *ἀπῆλθον* L.

9. *οὖν*: so ℵ^{c}ABCDLT^b &c., Old Lat., Vulg., Sah., Syr.$^{\text{hark.}}$; om. ℵ*V* 1, 61, 229, Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin. pesh.}}$, Boh. *Σαμαρεῖτις*: so ABΓΔΛΠ &c.; *Σαμαρῖτις* ℵCDLT^b. Similarly with *Σαμαρείτιδος*. *πεῖν*: so ℵ*AB*C*DLT^b; *πιεῖν* ℵ^{c}B^{3}C^{3}ΓΔΛΠ &c. *οὐ . . . Σαμαρίταις*: so ℵ^{a}ABCLT^b &c.; om. ℵ*D *a b e*.

10. *η ειδεις*: so MS, for *εἰ ᾔδεις* (so also A). *πιεῖν*: so ℵ^{c}AB^{3}C^3 &c.; *πεῖν* ℵ*B*C*DLT^b.

11. *ἡ γυνή*: so generally; *ἐκείνη* ℵ*; om. B. *οὖν*: so ABCLT^b &c.; om. ℵD, *a b e ff*^{2} *l*, Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin. pesh.}}$, Sah.

12. *ὅστις*: so ℵ; *ὅς* all other authorities.

13. *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*: so ΛΠ^2; *ὁ* om. ℵABCDLT^b &c.

14. *ὃς δ᾽ ἂν πίῃ*: so generally; *ὁ δὲ πίνων* ℵ*D. *οὐ μή*: so generally; *μή* om. D. *διψήσῃ*: so C^{3}ΛΠ &c.; *διψήσει* ℵABDLMT^{b}Γ. *ὃ δώσω*: so ABCLΓΔΛΠ; *ὃ ἐγὼ δώσω* ℵDMT^b, most Old Lat., Vulg., Syr.$^{\text{hark. pal.}}$

ⲁϥⲓ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲧⲅⲁⲗⲓⲗⲉⲁ· 4. ⲡⲉϩⲱϯ ϫⲉ ⲉⲗⲁϥⲡⲉ ⲛϥⲥⲓⲛⲓ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲧⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ

5. ⲁϥⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲗⲉⲛⲡⲉ ⲥⲩⲭⲁⲣ ϩⲁⲧ[ⲉ]ⲛⲡⲓⲟϩⲓ ⲉⲧⲁ[ⲓⲁⲕⲱ]ⲃ ⲧⲉⲓϥ ⲛⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ ⲡ$^{\text{sic}}$ⲉϣⲏⲗⲓ 6. ⲛ[ⲉ]ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲡⲏⲅⲏ ϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲁ[ⲉⲩ]ⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲓⲁⲕⲱⲃ· ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲁϥϩⲓⲥⲓ ⲉⲙⲁϣⲓ ϩⲓⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ· ⲁϥϩⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ ϩⲓϫⲉⲛϯ[ⲡ]ⲏⲅⲏ· ⲛⲉ[ⲡⲛⲉⲩ] ⲛϫⲉⲡ ⲥⲁⲡ[ⲉ] 7. ⲁⲥⲓ ⲛϫⲉ ⲟ[ⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ] ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲧⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲉⲙⲉϩⲙⲁⲩ· ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲉⲥ· ϫⲉⲁⲩⲓⲥ ⲧⲁⲥⲱ· 8. ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲁⲩϣⲏ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲕⲉⲥ ⲛⲥⲉϣⲱⲡ ⲛϩⲉ̄ϩⲣⲏⲟⲩⲓ· 9. ⲡⲉϫⲉⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲉϥ ⲛϫⲉ ϯⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲛⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ· ϫⲉⲡⲱⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲕ ⲉⲛⲧⲉⲕⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲓ· ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲛⲥⲉⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲧ ⲉⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲛⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ· ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲛⲓⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲙⲉⲩⲧⲟϩ ⲙⲛⲛⲓⲥⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ· 10. ⲁϥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲉϥ ⲛⲉⲥ· ϫⲉⲉⲛⲉⲁⲗⲥⲁⲟ̅ⲩ̅ ⲛϯⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ϯ̅ ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲉⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲉ ϫⲉⲁⲩⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲱ· ⲛⲧⲁ ϩⲱⲓ ⲛⲁⲗⲉⲉⲗⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲁϥⲡⲉ [ⲛϥϯ] ⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩ[ⲙⲁⲩ] ⲛⲱⲛϩ 11. ⲡⲉϫⲉ ϯⲥ[ϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲛⲉϥ] ϫⲉⲡⲟ̅ⲥ̅ [ⲟⲩⲇⲉ] ⲙⲙⲛ[ⲧ]ⲉ [3 or 4 let.] ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲧ[ⲕ ⲁⲩⲱ] ⲧϣ[ⲱ]ϯ ϣ[ⲏ$^{?}$ⲕ] ⲡⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲱⲛϩ ϭⲏ ⲁϥⲛⲧⲉⲕ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ· 12. ⲙⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲕ ⲟⲩⲛⲁϭ ⲛⲧⲁⲕ ⲉⲓⲁⲕⲱⲃ ⲡⲉⲛ[ⲓ]ⲱⲧ ⲡⲉⲓ ⲛⲧⲁϥϯ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϣⲱϯ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁϥ ϩⲱϥ ⲛ$^{\text{sic}}$ⲉⲥⲱ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲥⲡⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲉϥϩⲗⲁϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲧϥϣⲉⲛϣ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ· 13. ⲁϥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲉϥ ⲛⲉⲥ· ϫⲉⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲉⲥⲱ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ [ϩ]ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲙⲁⲩ ϥ[ⲛ]ⲉⲓⲃⲓ ⲁⲛ· 14. ⲡⲏ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲉⲥⲱ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲙⲡⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϯⲛⲉⲧⲉⲓϥ ⲛⲉϥ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ' ⲛⲛⲉϥⲓⲃⲓ ⲛϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ· ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϯⲛⲉⲧⲉⲓϥ ⲛⲉϥ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ' ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲡⲏⲅⲏ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥ-

ΑΙ[ΩΝ]ΙΟΝ· 15. ΛΕΓΕΙ [ΠΡΟϹ] ΑΥΤΟΝ [Η ΓΥΝΗ] Κ̅Ε̅ ΔΟ[Ϲ Μ]ΟΙ ΤΟΥΤΟ
ΤΟ [ΥΔΩΡ] ΙΝΑ ΜΗ ΔΙΨ[Ω] ΜΗΔΕ ΕΡΧΟ[ΜΑΙ] [ΕΝΘΑΔΕ Α]ΝΤΛ[ΕΙΝ]
16. ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΗ Ο Ι̅Ϲ̅ ΥΠΑΓΕ ΦΩΝΗϹΟΝ ϹΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑ· ΚΑΙ ΕΛΘΕ
ΕΝΘΑΔΕ 17. ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ Η ΓΥΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ· ΟΥΚ ΕΧΩ ΑΝΔΡΑ
ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΗ Ο Ι̅Ϲ̅ ΚΑΛΩϹ ΕΙΠΑϹ ΟΤΙ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΩ 18. ΠΕΝΤΕ
ΓΑΡ ΑΝΔΡΑϹ ΕϹΧΕϹ· ΚΑΙ Ν[ΥΝ] ΟΝ ΕΧΕΙϹ ΟΥΚ ΕϹΤΙΝ ϹΟΥ [ΑΝΗ]Ρ ΤΟΥΤΟ
[ΑΛΗΘ]ΕϹ ΕΙ[ΡΗΚΑϹ]. . . . . .

23. ΤΟΥϹ ΠΡΟϹΚΥΝΟΥΝΤΑϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΝ Π̅Ν̅Ι̅ 24. Π̅Ν̅Α̅ Ο Θ̅Ϲ̅· ΚΑΙ
ΤΟΥϹ ΠΡΟϹΚΥΝΟΥΝΤΑϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΝ Π̅Ν̅Ι̅ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ ΔΕΙ ΠΡΟϹΚΥΝΕΝ
25. ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ Η ΓΥΝΗ ΟΙΔΑ ΟΤΙ ΜΕϹ[ϹΙΑϹ] ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ Ο ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΟϹ Χ̅Ϲ̅
ΟΤΑΝ ΕΛΘΗ ΕΚΕΙΝΟϹ ΑΝΑΓ[ΓΕ]ΛΕΙ ΗΜΙΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ 26. ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΗ Ο Ι̅Ϲ̅
ΕΓΩ ΕΙ[ΜΙ Ο] ΛΑΛΩΝ Ϲ[ΟΙ]

27. ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥΤΩ [ΗΛΘ]ΟΝ ΟΙ Μ[ΑΘΗΤ]ΑΙ ΑΥ[ΤΟΥ] ΚΑΙ ΕΘΑΥ[ΜΑΖ]ΟΝ
ΟΤΙ ΜΕ[ΤΑ ΓΥ]ΝΑΙΚΟϹ [ΕΛΑΛ]ΕΙ ΟΥΔΕΙϹ [ΜΕΝ]ΤΟΙ ΕΙΠΕ¯ [ΤΙ] ΖΗΤΕΙϹ Η ΤΙ
[ΛΑΛΕΙϹ] ΜΕ[Τ ΑΥ]ΤΗϹ 28. [ΑΦΗ]ΚΕΝ ΟΥΝ [ΤΗ]Ν ΥΔΡΙΑΝ [ΑΥΤ]ΗϹ Η ΓΥΝΗ
[ΚΑΙ] ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ [ΕΙϹ] ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙ¯ [ΚΑ]Ι ΛΕΓΕΙ ΤΟΙϹ [ΑΝ]Ο̅Ι̅Ϲ̅ 29. ΔΕΥΤΕ
[Ι]ΔΕΤΕ Α̅Ν̅Ο̅Ν̅ [Ο]Ϲ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΜΟΙ [ΠΑΝ]ΤΑ ΟϹΑ ΕΠΟΙΗϹΑ· ΜΗΤΙ ΟΥΤΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ Ο
Χ̅Ϲ̅ 30. ΕΞΗΛΘΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΕΚ ΤΗϹ ΠΟΛΕΩϹ ΚΑΙ ΗΡΧΟΝΤΟ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟ¯

31. ΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΩ ΜΕΤΑΞΥ ΗΡΩΤΩ¯ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕϹ

15. *διψῶ*: so generally; *δειψήσω* D. *ἔρχομαι*: so ℵ^{c}EFGHKLMΛ; *ἔρχωμαι* ACDSUVΓΔΠ; *διέρχομαι* B; *διέρχωμαι* ℵ*.

16. *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*: so ℵ^{c}C^{2}DLΓ &c.; *ὁ* om. ℵ*ΑΛΠ*; *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* om. BC*. *σοῦ τὸν ἄνδρα*: so B 69, 74, 248, 254; *τὸν ἄνδρα σου* generally.

17. *αὐτῷ*: so BCEFGH, *a b l*, Sah., Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin. pesh.}}$; om. ℵ^{c}ADKLM &c., most Old Lat., Vulg., Boh., Syr.$^{\text{hark.}}$; ℵ* also om. *καὶ εἶπεν*. *οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα*: so ABC^{3}ΓΔΛΠ; *ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω* ℵC*DL. *εἶπας*: so AB^{3}CDLΓΔΛΠ &c.; *εἶπες* ℵB*. *ἔχω*: so ABCLΓ &c.; *ἔχεις* ℵD, *b c e l*.

18. *ἀληθές*: so generally; *ἀληθῶς* ℵE.

. . . .

23. *ἐν πνεύματι*: so one cursive (124), *a b*; om. all other authorities.

24. *αὐτόν*: so ℵ^{c}ABCD^{2}L &c.; om. ℵ*D*, *d ff*^{2}. *δεῖ προσκυνεῖν*: so ℵ^{c}ABCL &c.; *προσκυνεῖν δεῖ* ℵ*D.

25. *οἶδα*: so generally; *οἴδαμεν* ℵ^{c}GLΛ 13, 33, 69, Boh., Sah. *πάντα*: so generally; *ἅπαντα* ℵBC*.

27. *ἐπὶ τούτῳ*: so generally; *ἐν τούτῳ* ℵ*D, Boh. *ἦλθον*: so generally; *ἦλθαν* B*; *ἐπῆλθαν* ℵ*. *ἐθαύμαζον*: so ℵABCDGHKLMΠ &c.; *ἐθαύμασαν* ESUVΓΔΛ, Sah. *εἶπεν*: so generally; + *αὐτῷ* ℵD, *a b ff*^{2}, Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin.}}$, Boh.

29. *ὅσα*: so AC^{3}DLΓ &c.; *ἅ* ℵBC*, *a d e q*, Sah., Boh., Syr.$^{\text{cur. sin. pesh.}}$

30. *οὖν*: so ℵΛ 1, 69, *e f l q*; om. ABLΓΔΠ; *καὶ ἐξῆλθον* CD, Syr. omn.

31. *δέ*: so AC^{3}ΓΔΛΠ &c.; om. ℵBC*DL.

ϫⲓⲡⲏⲓ ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲛϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ· 15. ⲡⲉϫⲉ ϯⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲛⲉ[ϥ·] ϫⲉⲡ̅ⲟ̅ⲥ̅· ⲙⲁⲓ ⲛⲏ[ⲓ] ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ ⲕⲉⲥ ⲛⲧ[ⲁϣ]ⲧⲉⲙⲓⲃⲓ ϭⲏ· [ⲟⲩ]ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧ[ⲁϣⲧⲉⲙ]ⲓ ⲉ

[2 lines lost.]

16. ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲉⲥ ϫⲉⲙⲁϣ ⲙⲟⲩϯ ⲉⲡⲉϩⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲙⲏ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲙⲉ· 17. ⲁⲥⲉⲗⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ϯⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲉⲥ·$^{\text{sic}}$ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲉⲙⲙⲛϯϩⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲉⲩ· [ⲡⲉ]ϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲉⲥ· [ϫⲉ]ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ ⲁⲗϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉⲙⲙⲛ[ϯϩⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲉ]ⲩ 18. ⲁ[ⲗϫ]ⲓ [ⲅⲁ]ⲣ ⲛⲉ̅ [ⲛ]ϩ[ⲉⲓ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉ[ⲟⲩⲉⲓ] ⲉⲧⲉⲛ[ⲉⲙⲉ ϯⲛ]ⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉ[ϩⲉⲓ ⲉ]ⲛⲡⲉ [ⲡ]ⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲓⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲁⲗϫⲁⲥ·

[vv. 19–23 *a* lost.]

23. ⲉⲩⲛⲉ[ⲟ]ⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲙⲙⲁϥ [ϩ]ⲛⲟⲩⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ 24. ⲟ[ⲩ]ⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ⲡⲉ ⲫ̅ϯ ⲁ[ⲩ]ⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ[ⲉⲟⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲛⲉϥ] ϣϣⲏ ⲛⲉ[ⲩ ⲉ]ⲟⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲛ[ⲉϥ] ϩⲛⲛⲟⲩ[ⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅] ⲙⲛⲟⲩ[ⲙⲉⲓ] 25. ⲡⲉϫⲉⲥ ⲛⲉϥ ⲛϫⲉ ϯⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ϫⲉⲧ[ⲉⲛ]ⲉⲙⲓ ϫⲉ[ϥⲛⲏⲟⲩ] ⲛϫⲉ ⲙⲉⲥ[ⲓⲁⲥ] ⲡⲉⲧⲉϣⲁ[ⲩⲙⲟⲩϯ] ⲉⲗⲁϥ ϫ[ⲉⲡ·ⲭ̅ⲣ̅ⲥ̅] ⲉϣⲱⲡ ⲟⲩ$^{?}$[ⲛ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ]ϣⲏ ⲛϫⲉ ⲡ[ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ] ϥⲛⲉⲧⲁⲙ[ⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲱⲃ] ⲛⲓⲃⲓ· 26. ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲉⲥ ϫⲉⲁⲛⲁ[ⲕⲡⲉ] ⲡ

[1 line lost.]

27. ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲓ ⲛϫⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁⲩⲉⲗⲙⲁⲓϩⲓ ϫⲉⲁϥϣⲉϫⲓ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ· ⲙⲡⲉⲗⲗⲁⲡϯ ⲙⲛⲛ ϫⲁⲥ ϫⲉⲁⲕⲕⲱϯ ⲛⲥⲁⲟⲩⲛ· ⲓ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲛⲕϣⲉϫⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲥ 28. ϯⲥϩⲓⲙⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲥⲕⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲥϩⲩⲇⲣⲓⲁ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ· ⲁⲥϣⲏ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲉⲥ ⲛⲛⲓⲗⲱⲙⲓ 29. ϫⲉⲁⲙⲟⲓⲛⲓ ⲧⲁⲗⲉⲧⲉ̅$^{\text{sic}}$ⲛⲛⲉⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲗⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϥϫ[ⲉ ? [1]] ⲉⲧⲁⲓ[ⲉⲓⲧⲟⲩ] ⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲡⲉⲓⲡⲉ ⲡ·ⲭ̅ⲣ̅ⲥ̅· 30. ⲁⲩⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲓ ϣⲁⲗⲁ[ϥ]

31. ⲛⲁⲩϫⲱ ⲇ[ⲉ ⲙ]ⲙⲁⲥ [ⲛⲉ]ϥ [ⲟⲩⲧ]ⲱ$^{?}$ⲟⲩ [ⲛⲉⲙⲉϥ

---

[1] Not space for ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲛⲏⲓ.

ραββει φαγε 32. ο δε ειπεν αυτοιϲ εγω βρωϲιν εχω φαγειν.
ην υμειϲ ουκ οιδατε
33. ελεγον ουν οι μαθηται προϲ αλληλουϲ· μη τιϲ ηνεγκεν αυτω
φαγειν· 34. λεγει αυτοιϲ ο [ι̅ϲ̅] εμον βρω[μα εϲ]τιν ιν[α

[3 lines lost]

και τ]ελειωϲ[ω] [αυτ]ου το εργο¯ 35. [ου]χ υμειϲ λε[γετ]ε οτι
τε[τραμ]ηνοϲ [εϲτιν κ]αι ο θε[ριϲμο]ϲ ερχ[ε][ται ιδ]ου λ[εγω]

[ϛ] ΠΕΡΙ [ΤΟΥ ΥΥ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΥ]

45. εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλαιοι παντα εωρακοτεϲ οϲα εποιηϲεν εν
ιεροϲολυμοιϲ εν τη εορτη και αυτοι γαρ ηλθον ειϲ την εορτη¯
46. ηλθεν ουν παλιν ειϲ την κανα τηϲ γαλιλαιαϲ οπου εποιηϲεν
το υδωρ οινον· και ην τιϲ βαϲιλικοϲ ου ο υ̅ϲ̅ ηϲθενει εν καφαρναουμ·
47. ουτοϲ ακουϲαϲ οτι ι̅ϲ̅ ηκει εκ τηϲ ιουδαιαϲ ειϲ την γαλιλαιαν
απηλθεν προϲ αυτον και ηρωτα ινα καταβη και ϊαϲηται αυτου τον
υιον ημελλεν γαρ αποθνηϲκει¯ 48. [ειπ]εν ουν ο ι̅ϲ̅ προϲ αυτον·
[εα]ν μη ϲημεια [κα]ι τερατα ιδη[τε ο]υ μη πιϲτευϲητε· 49. λεγει
προϲ αυ[τον] ο βαϲιλικοϲ [κ̅ε̅]

33. *ἔλεγον οὖν*: so generally; *λέγουσιν* ℵ*.

35. *ὅτι*: so DLΠ* 13, 28, 69, &c., Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$; + *ἔτι* ℵABCT^{b} &c., Old Lat., Vulg., Boh., Syr.$^{\text{sin. pesh. hark.}}$

. . . .

45. *ὅσα*: so ℵ^{c}ABCLΠ^{2}; *ἅ* ℵ*DT^{b}Γ &c.

46. *πάλιν*: so ℵBCDL, Old Lat., Vulg., Boh., Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$; + *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* ΑΓΔΛΠ &c. *καὶ ἦν*: so ABCΓΔΛΠ &c.; *ἦν δέ* ℵDLT^{b}, 33, Old Lat., Boh. *Καφαρναούμ*: so ℵBCDT^{b}; *Καπερναούμ* ALΓΔΛΠ &c.

47. *ἠρώτα*: so ℵBCDLT^{b} 33, 69, *a e l q*; + *αὐτόν* ΑΓΔΛΠ &c., *b c f*, Vulg., Syr. omn., Boh.

The results of this collation may be summarized as follows. The MS has two readings peculiar to itself, viz. *οὐ μή* for *μή* in iii 18 and *ἐκάθισεν* for *ἐκαθέζετο* in iv 6; and a few slenderly supported readings, viz. *ὅστις* in iv 12 (with ℵ), the insertion of *ὁ* in iv 13 (with ΑΠ^{2}), and the addition of *ἐν πνεύματι* in iv 23 (with one cursive and two Old Latin MSS). These, however, are not of much importance. What is of more consequence is to see in what company the new MS is generally found, and thereby

ⲛϫⲉ] ⲛⲓⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲩϫⲱ [ⲙⲙ]ⲁⲥ ϫⲉⲣⲁⲃⲃⲓ ⲟⲩⲱ[ⲙ]
32. ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉϫ[ⲉϥ] ⲛⲉⲩ ϫⲉⲟⲩ[ⲁⲛ]ⲧⲏⲓ ⲁⲛⲁ[ⲕ ⲟⲩ]ϩⲣⲏ
ⲉⲟ[ⲩⲁⲙⲥ] ⲧⲉⲓ ⲛⲧ[ⲁⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲉ]ⲧⲉⲛ ⲥ[ⲁⲟⲩⲛ]

[3 lines lost.]

33. ϫⲉⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲥ ⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲉϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲙ· 34. ⲡⲉ-
ϫⲉϥ ⲛⲉⲩ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉⲧⲁϩⲣⲏ ⲁⲛⲁⲕⲧⲉ ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲧⲁⲓⲗⲓ
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉϩⲛⲉϥ ⲙⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲁϥⲧⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁϫⲱⲕ ⲙ-
ⲡⲉϥϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ’ 35. ⲙⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲛ ⲉⲛ ⲉⲧϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ·
ϫⲉⲉⲧⲓ ⲕⲉⲇ̅ ⲛⲁⲃⲁⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲟϩⲥ [ⲛ]ⲏⲟⲩ ϩⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϯϫⲱ
ⲙⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛ ϫⲉϥⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲃⲉⲗ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ

[vv. 35 *b*–45 *a* lost.]

45. ⲁⲩϣⲁⲛϥ ⲉⲗ[ⲱⲟⲩ] ⲛϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲗⲉⲙⲧⲅⲁⲗⲓⲗⲉⲁ· ⲉⲧⲁⲩ-
ⲛⲉⲩ ⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϥⲉⲓⲧⲟⲩ ϩⲛⲓ̅ⲉ̅ⲙ̅ ϩⲙⲡϣⲉⲓ· ⲛⲧⲁⲩ
ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲁⲩⲓ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲉⲡϣⲉⲓ·

46. ⲁϥⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲅⲁⲗⲓⲗⲉⲁ· ⲉⲡⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲁϥ-
ⲧ$^{\text{sic}}$ⲉ̈ⲡ[ⲙⲁⲩ] ⲉⲗⲏⲗⲡ ⲙ[ⲙⲉⲩ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲁ[ⲛ] ⲟⲩⲃⲁⲥⲓ-
ⲗ[ⲓⲕⲟⲥ] ⲙⲙⲉⲩⲡ[ⲉ] ⲉⲗⲉⲡⲉϥ[ϣⲏⲗⲓ] ϣⲱⲛⲓ ϩⲛ[ⲕⲁ]ⲫⲁⲣ-
ⲛⲁⲟ[ⲩⲙ] 47. ⲉⲧⲁⲡⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ϫⲉⲁϥⲓ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅
ⲉⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲧϩⲓⲟⲩⲓⲇⲉⲁ ⲉϩⲟⲩ̅ ⲉⲧⲅⲁⲗⲓⲗⲉⲁ· ⲁϥϣⲏ ϣⲁⲗⲁϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁϥⲧⲱⲃϩ ⲙⲙⲁϥⲡⲉ ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲛϥⲓ ⲉϩⲗⲏⲓ ⲙⲙⲉⲩ·
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛϥⲧⲉⲗϭⲉⲡⲉϥϣⲏⲗⲓ ⲛⲁϥⲛⲉⲙⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣⲡⲉ· 48. ⲡⲉ-
ϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲉϥ· ϫⲉⲁⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛϣⲧⲉⲙⲛⲉⲩ ⲉϩⲉⲛⲙⲏⲓⲛ ⲙⲛ
ϩⲉⲛϣⲡⲏⲣⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉ̅ⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲉⲛ 49. [ⲡⲉϫⲉ]ϥ ⲛⲉϥ
ⲛϫⲉ [ⲡⲓ]ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲓⲕⲟⲥ ϫⲉ[ⲡ̅ⲟ̅]ⲥ̅ (*sic expl.*)

---

to judge of the character of its text. An examination of its grouping in a purely statistical manner gives the following results.

The new MS	is found	with	ℵ 31	times,	against it	58	times.
"	"	"	A 62	"	"	27	"
"	"	"	B 56	"	"	35	"
"	"	"	C 38	"	"	18	"
"	"	"	D 32	"	"	33	"
"	"	"	L 63	"	"	29	"
"	"	"	T^{b}34	"	"	17	"

These figures, however, do not lead to any very lucid result, since they seem to indicate that the MS is equally akin to A and C, on the one hand, and to L and T^b on the other; that it is quite undecided in its allegiance to D, somewhat inclined to B, and decidedly hostile only to ℵ. It is necessary, therefore, to look a little more closely at the details of the collation; and in this way a clearer conclusion may be arrived at.

In the first place it will be found that the MS supports practically no reading of which the attestation is purely 'Syrian.' The nearest approach to such readings will be found in iii 15, where, however, its εἰς αὐτόν has the support of ℵ and the Old Latin; iii 17, where αὐτοῦ also is supported by the Old Latin; πιεῖν in iv 7, 10, against which may be set πεῖν in verse 9, so that the variation may be put down to the scribe of the MS; ὁ before Ἰησοῦς in iv 13 (with ΛΠ^2), διψήσῃ in iv 14 (with C^{3}ΛΠ), ἔρχομαι in iv 15, and δέ in iv 31. These, it will be seen, are all variants of the most trifling description, such as might be introduced into any MS by the ordinary vagaries of a scribe, and without proving anything with regard to its parentage. Against these may be set the decisive rejection of purely 'Syrian' readings in all other cases; and the MS may be definitely declared not to belong to the 'Syrian' group of authorities.

The same may be said with regard to the 'Western' group. The MS shares many readings with D, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac, and the cursives belonging to this group; but it has hardly any readings which are the special property of these authorities. iii 21, τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (LU, 33, 69, most Old Lat. MSS) has mainly Western attestation, but not unmixed; iii 26, ἰδού (D, 1, 209) is more decidedly Western, but is unimportant; and the same may be said of the omission of ἐγώ in iii 28 (D, *a l*, Syr.$^{\text{cur.}}$). A stronger case is Ἰησοῦς in iv 1, but even here the attestation is not wholly Western; and by themselves these instances cannot establish the presence of any clear 'Western' element in the MS.

There remain the 'Neutral' and 'Alexandrian' groups, if we accept Hort's classification; and between these the choice might be difficult, if it were necessary to make one. What seems clear is that the authorities with which our MS has the closest affinities are A (but not in its characteristically 'Syrian' readings) L and T^b; and these are all MSS having the closest connexion with Egypt. A had its home in Egypt as far back as we can trace it, L is generally recognized as having Egyptian affinities, and T^b is a bilingual Graeco-Sahidic fragment, about contemporary with our MS. On the other hand, though our MS agrees with B oftener than it disagrees with it, and is not unfrequently found in combination with the group ℵBL, it can hardly be said to enter that select body which Hort marks off as 'Neutral.'

The conclusion, therefore, to which our examination appears to lead is that our MS presents a text of the Egyptian family (which may be called Alexandrian if we like), and that this text is an old and good one, possessing neither characteristically 'Western' nor characteristically 'Syrian' features, but entering into combination with the best authorities, and possessing practically no vagaries of its own. In all the more important passages contained within the limits of the fragment, such as iii 13, 15, 31, iv 9, its evidence is clearly on the better side. Quite apart from its importance for the history of the Coptic version, this fragment, within its limits, is of real value in localizing this type of Greek text in Egypt, and thus bears upon one of the most important open questions in the textual criticism of the New Testament at the present day.

W. E. CRUM.
F. G. KENYON.

NOTES

ON THE ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙ OF PHILIPPI.

(*See* J. T. S., *Oct.*, 1899, *p.* 114.)

THE magistrates of the Roman *colonia* of Philippi are called by St. Luke στρατηγοί. This Greek word was generally employed to translate the Latin *praetores*, and, as in some few cases the magistrates of a *colonia* were certainly called *praetores*, it has accordingly been conjectured that the magistrates of Philippi bore this title, instead of the usual title *duoviri*. The conjecture is an obvious one, but it seems open to several objections.

In the first place, it is unnecessary, for στρατηγοί can unquestionably be used as a translation or equivalent of *duoviri*.

In the second place, it is a far cry, both in space and in time, from Philippi to the known examples of municipal *praetores*. Those instances occur in Italy and, among the provinces, in Narbonese Gaul, and, as it appears, only in Narbonese Gaul. There are so many local peculiarities in the Empire that it is dangerous to argue from a province in the West to a province in the East. It is the more dangerous in the present matter, since an adequate reason can easily be assigned for the special occurrence of *praetores* in Narbonese Gaul. The capital of that province, Narbo, was by far the earliest *colonia* founded by the Romans outside the Alps: it was established in B.C. 118. Now at that time the title *praetores* was not uncommonly used in Italy to denote the chief magistrates of a municipality. It was perfectly natural for the chief magistrates of an extra-Italian *colonia* to be then called praetors, and the title actually occurs on an early inscription of Narbo. It was equally natural for Narbo to set the pattern for other *coloniae* in Narbonese Gaul. On the other hand, more than seventy years elapsed after the founding of Narbo before any fresh *coloniae* were planted outside of Italy, and during that period the title of *praetores* had been giving way to the title *duoviri*. Why it did so, and whether the change was gradual or due to legislation in part, does not now concern us. But if we may argue from Cicero's words in B. C. 63, it had become unusual by that date in *coloniae* and had been generally superseded by *duoviri*. The inscriptions tell the same tale: praetors are mentioned on early inscriptions, *duoviri* on later, and occasionally an early inscription mentions a *praetor duomvir*, suggesting a transitional period. The result of this tendency is that we should not expect to find the magistrates called praetors in a *colonia* like Philippi in Macedonia, founded (at the very earliest) in B. C. 42. And as a matter of fact we do not find praetors there: the inscriptions, so far as they attest anything material, attest *duoviri*. Nor do we meet *praetores* in any of the *coloniae* founded about the same time as Philippi, save only in Gaul. Even in Gaul the title disappeared, as it seems, not so very long after Philippi was founded.

And, thirdly, if the magistrates were ever called *praetores* at Philippi, we should not expect to meet the title in St. Luke. St. Paul's visit to the town took place, I suppose, about the middle of the first century A. D. By that time the title seems to have disappeared almost entirely and *duoviri* had become universal.

My arguments, of course, constitute nothing beyond a probability. Were an inscription unearthed at Philippi or elsewhere, which mentioned a praetor or praetors of that *colonia*, these arguments would vanish. But I believe I may assert that our existing evidence does not encourage us to expect such a discovery.

F. HAVERFIELD.

CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF LATIN MSS.

FEW classes of literature are better represented among ancient manuscripts—manuscripts, that is, of the age of Charles the Great or earlier—than canon law; and most of them have been excellently described and discussed in Professor Maassen's invaluable *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande*. But the thirty years that have elapsed since Maassen wrote have witnessed many publications and produced many catalogues which have made the treasures of European libraries more and more accessible; and as it is now just ten years since I began working at the subject, I find myself able occasionally to supplement and more rarely to correct the information so ably put together by Maassen.

1. *The Manuscripts of the Jesuit Collège de Clermont in Paris.*

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the libraries of France contained, when taken together, probably more valuable Latin manuscripts than the rest of Europe put together. Not that there was any one library of transcending importance: the collections which were to make the Royal library famous had hardly begun to be formed. It was in the number and interest of the capitular and monastic libraries of the provinces that France was rich: such were the Benedictine libraries of Corbie near Amiens, of Fleury near Orleans, of Marmoutier at Tours, of St. Remy at Reims; such were the Cathedral libraries of Tours, Lyons, Reims, or Laon. But the centripetal tendency was already at work: the sources of knowledge were being gathered together to the greater centres of public life: the Bodleian library was enriched by the liberality of Archbishop Laud, the Vatican library was brought into the front rank by the accession of Queen Christina's (mainly French) collections and by the spoils of the Thirty Years' War from the Palatinate. In Paris, before the Royal library grew large, before even the Benedictines brought their treasures up from Corbie to the Paris House of St. Germain des Prés (in 1638), the Jesuit Collège de Clermont had begun, through the energies of the earliest of the great line of French patristic scholars, Jacques Sirmond, to draw together a mass of ancient manuscripts from the ecclesiastical and religious establishments of the provinces. It is not, I imagine, known by what precise means this transfer of treasures was effected; but I suppose that Sirmond, in his wanderings round France, found the monks or canons more willing to lend him the manuscripts he pressed for than to take the trouble to ask for them back again. Anyhow, the great majority of the MSS on which Sirmond worked in Paris remained in the library of the Jesuit House[1].

The primacy of learning soon passed to the Benedictines; but the library of the College of Clermont flourished for a century and a half, until the moment when it became involved in the general catastrophe and confiscation which befell the Jesuit order throughout most of Europe. The catalogue of the manuscripts for sale in 1764, drawn up by Benedictines from St. Germain, includes 50 Oriental, 341 Greek, and 349 Latin codices. By far the larger number of the MSS passed into the hands of a Dutch scholar, G. Meerman; but the Royal library annexed 7 of the Latin MSS, and, as will be seen, it is possible that the

---

[1] Not perhaps all: the MS of Paschal computations—containing Victorius, Theophilus, Cyril, Proterius, and Ps. Anatolius; see B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie: Der 84jährige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 210—from which both Petavius and Bucherius in their respective works, *De doctrina temporum*, were allowed by Sirmond to draw, did not apparently remain in the College; at least, there seems to be no trace of it in the 1764 catalogue, of which I shall speak immediately. If the MS is identical, as I conjecture, with MS 42 of the old Cathedral library of St. Martin at Tours = MS 334 of the Town library (fragments of which were stolen by Libri, and have been recovered for the Bibliothèque Nationale, *Nouvelles acquisitions latines, Fonds Libri*, 1612, 1613, 1614), then it must be supposed that the Chapter did in the end demand and receive back their property. Of Sirmond's connexion with the Clermont MS of Irenaeus I hope to speak on a future occasion.

Benedictines (in return for their trouble over the catalogue?) did not go without a small share in the spoil. Some MSS were perhaps sold in turn by Meerman: at any rate, when his collections were put up to auction after the death of his son at the Hague in 1824, the catalogue then drawn up contained only 250 Latin MSS, so that after reckoning the French king's perquisites nearly 100 remain unaccounted for. At the Hague sale the principal purchaser was Sir Thomas Phillipps, who bought 190 out of the 250 just mentioned; next to him came the University of Oxford, represented at the sale by Dr. Thomas Gaisford, Regius Professor of Greek, and afterwards Dean of Christ Church. Dr. Gaisford's interests were primarily Greek, so that it is no wonder that 39 Greek MSS were bought for the University to 15 Latin; and as he was a classical rather than a theological scholar, the majority of the 15 MSS are classical too[1]. But at least he secured (and for only 131 florins) the copy of Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius which Mommsen has shown us to be the oldest in existence.

Sir T. Phillipps' library was sold in its turn, and the Clermont-Meerman section of it was acquired *en bloc* by the Royal library at Berlin (1887). An admirably full catalogue, with historical introduction, was published by Valentin Rose in 1893.

Of the Clermont catalogue of 1764, Nos. 492 and 560–575 consisted wholly or principally of early collections of canons. Of these seventeen, thirteen are now at Berlin; of the remaining four (Nos. 562, 563, 564, 568), one (No. 568, a ninth-century 'systematic' collection of canons *de poenitentia de accusatis de sacris ordinibus et privilegiis clericorum*) is successfully identified by Rose as No. 478 of Geel's supplement to the Leyden catalogue: Meerman appears to have sold some MSS to the Leyden library about 1770.

No. 562 (early ninth century) differs from the other three of this group in the fact that the greater part of it can still be identified in the Meerman catalogue of 1824. The first 36 leaves—containing the Acts of the Fifth General Council, a catalogue of Popes down to Paschal I (A.D. 817–824), the Athanasian Creed, the *Fides* of St. Augustine, the *Fides* of St. Jerome, the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, and one or two other fragments—had already disappeared, and I have been unable to trace them. The other 191 leaves formed No. 583 in the Meerman sale catalogue, and consisted of spurious correspondence between Jerome and Damasus, the *Notitia ciuitatum* and a 'collectio copiosa' of canons, decretals, and episcopal constitutions. It ought not to be difficult to find out the fate of so considerable a manuscript, but I have not succeeded so far.

---

[1] Rose, in the Berlin catalogue, to which I shall come in a moment, laments (p. iii) that nothing is known of the fate of the Livy, the Pliny, the Solinus, the Macrobius, the Priscian, the Donatus, the Marius Victorinus on Cicero, the Venantius Fortunatus. All of them are in the Bodleian: see the catalogue of purchases for 1824. The information (since Rose wrote) has become generally accessible through Mr. Madan's *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS* iv pp. 433–442. The Macrobius was bought not at the sale itself, but from its purchaser at the sale. Another purchaser of Meerman MSS was Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen College: in the sale catalogue of his MSS, made after his death in 1854, an Olympiodorus *Catena in Job* (saec. xv, folio) and a Cyprian *Epistolae* (saec. xii–xiii, folio) are both marked as Meerman MSS: these are Clermont 59 = Meerman 36, and Clermont 439 = Meerman 440 (152 leaves: saec. xiii). The British Museum possesses Meerman MSS in Add. 15242, 15270–3, and 15276: two of these are Greek military writings, Add. 15270–3 is *Johannis Scoti in iv libb. Sententiarum Quaestiones* (Clermont 543 = Meerman 482).

Nos. 563 and 564 did not appear in the catalogue of 1824, for a very good reason. In the stormy times of the Revolution the great Benedictine library at Paris was in danger of the fate which thirty years earlier had befallen the Jesuit MSS. The great majority of the codices from St. Germain des Prés did, in the end, find their way safely to the National library. But there had been an interval during which no inconsiderable leakage had taken place; and an attaché of the Russian Embassy, Peter Dubrowsky, secured a group of manuscripts which he ultimately presented to the Imperial library at St. Petersburg. Among them, under the press-mark F II 3, is a manuscript of canons which I have identified beyond reasonable doubt with the two Clermont manuscripts, 563, 564; and I shall further prove that both of them once formed part of a single manuscript with Clermont 569 (= Meerman 587 = Phillipps 1745) = Berlin lat. 83.

(1) *Clermont* 563, 564, *formed part of a single MS.* Both are described as of the eighth century, written in rustic character, in square form[1], and charred at the top of the leaves. The presumption suggested by these points of contact is raised to a certainty by the correspondence of the two, taken together, with the Petersburg MS.

(2) *Identity of Petersburg F II* 3 *with Clermont* 563, 564. The Petersburg MS is described in *Neues Archiv* v. p. 616, by Dr. K. Gillert, as an uncial MS of canons of the seventh century which has suffered much damage from fire. It contains 185 leaves; Clermont 562 contained 84, Clermont 563 contained 110 leaves, or 194 between them. Allowing for hasty numeration, for guard-leaves, and for possible loss between A. D. 1764 and the end of the century, the agreement is almost exact. So with the contents. Clermont 563 contained '1° Canones Apostolici, 2° Canones Africani, 3° Canones Gallicani nempe Conciliorum Arelatensis Vasensis Agathensis Epaonensis Aurelianensis Arela-

---

[1] That 563 is called quarto, 564 folio, may be due to the fact that the charred leaves were cut (this is exactly what Dr. Gillert tells us of the Petersburg MS), and the size of 563 thus reduced.

tensis ii, 4° Codex Canonum Dionysii Exigui.' It is very clear that all this cannot really have been contained in a MS of only 84 leaves; the cataloguer must have taken the items from a table of contents at the beginning. We turn to the Petersburg MS, and we find that folios 2 *b*–32 *b* are occupied with an index of all the contents of the MS, and that these include, 'besides the complete Dionysiana, the decrees of the synods of Ancyra, Arles, Valence, Fréjus, Riez, Orange, Vaison, Arles, Agde, Orleans, Arles ii.' The first, second, and fourth items of the Clermont MS correspond to the 'complete Dionysiana'; of Gallic councils the Clermont list has six, the Petersburg ten, the five given in common being exactly the last five of the Petersburg list[1], so that I suppose the Clermont cataloguer either overlooked the earlier group in his hurry, or found the pages of the list containing them too much injured to be easily read. Similarly with Clermont 564, whose contents are 'Dionysii Exigui collectio canonum, in cujus fine legitur *Expliciunt canones ecclesiastici ex scrinio ecclesiae Romanae translati. Amen.* Canones Ancyrani et Arelatenses.' The Petersburg MS contains, foll. 33–178, the text of the Dionysiana, and at its close the words *Expliciunt canones ecclesiastici ex scrinio ecclesiae Romanae sumpti*; foll. 178–185, the canons of Ancyra (no doubt in some other version than that of Dionysius); and fol. 185, the opening words of the first synod of Arles.

(3) *Petersburg F II* 3 (= *Clermont* 563, 564) *was part of the same MS as Berlin* 83 (= *Clermont* 569). The Petersburg MS, according to Gillert, consists of twenty-two sheets; the Berlin MS[2] has the signature xxiii at the end of its first gathering. The Petersburg MS ends at the beginning of the First Council of Arles; the Berlin MS begins in the middle of canon 16 of the same council. The list prefixed to the Petersburg MS mentions the following Gallic councils which are no longer contained in its text: Valence, Fréjus, Riez, Orange, Vaison, Arles, Agde (add Epaon from the Clermont catalogue), Orleans, Arles ii. The Berlin MS contains the text of Valence, Fréjus (this is really a letter from the council of Valence to the people of Fréjus, but the MS inscribes it *Concl foroliensi*), Riez, Orange, Vaison, Arles, Agde, Orleans, Epaon, Arles, Carpentras, Orange, Auvergne, Orleans ii, Orleans iii. The correspondence for the first two-thirds of these items is complete: the last five are, I suppose, either a supplement to the original collection, or else the index in the Petersburg MS has suffered loss, or special injury, at this point.

The whole history of the MS since 1764 is thus clear; at one time or another within a century and a half some part of it has found a home in

---

[1] That the Clermont catalogue is right in adding Epaon, against the silence of Dr. Gillert, will become clear in the next paragraph.

[2] See Rose's catalogue, pp. 167–171.

Paris, St. Petersburg, Berlin, the Hague, and England. Of its earlier history there is less to be said. But it can be carried back to the year 1629, when it is the subject of special mention by Sirmond in the preface to his *Concilia antiqua Galliae.* We learn from his words that it was at that time perfect and undivided, and that it belonged to the Cathedral of Lyons. 'In Lugdunensi, verbi gratia, Ecclesiae Metropolitanae codice, post Dionysianam collectionem, quam primo habet loco, Synodi Gallicanae subiciuntur,' and the list of Gallican councils follows, exactly as we find them in Berlin 83 to-day[1]. The division of the MS was made doubtless in the Clermont library, and for the purpose of sorting the contents according to subject matter; Clermont 562 and 563 containing Greek and African councils, 569 Gallic only.

Lyons may well have been the home of the manuscript from the moment it was written; for Cathedral libraries, as witness that of Verona, have often had a specially undisturbed history. But from the Petersburg part of the MS we learn that the Dionysian collection in it was drawn direct from the official archives of the Roman see, *ex scrinio ecclesiae Romanae.* Italy therefore, as well as France, Russia, Holland, England, and Germany, has its share in the history of this truly cosmopolitan manuscript.

For the Gallic councils it was used both by Sirmond, and in our own day by Maassen. But its Dionysian collection and its text of Ancyra—no doubt either the Isidorian or the Gallic version—have (as far as I know) been neglected by all editors of the councils: Maassen does not mention it, and when I published the first part of *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* a year ago, I was myself still unacquainted with it; nor have I yet had the opportunity of collating it, though I hope to do so before the appearance of my next *fasciculus.* But if the MS is, as I think we may assume, of earlier date than A.D. 774[2], the date of the official edition sent to Gaul by Pope Hadrian, it gains at once in interest; for MSS of the 'pure Dionysiana' are very few, and none of those hitherto known, with one exception, were older than the ninth century. The exception is Vat. 5845, an eighth (perhaps late eighth) century MS, written in Father Ehrle's opinion at Capua or Beneventum. The Lyons MS on the other hand was taken directly from head quarters[3], and shows the contents of the official Roman book of canons about A.D. 700. In one point at least that official edition had already undergone expansion since Dionysius wrote at the beginning of the sixth century: for Dionysius omitted all lists of signatures to the councils, and their presence is one of the chief distinctions of Pope Hadrian's edition. As Gillert tells us expressly that the Petersburg MS contains subscriptions to the councils, this addition to the original Dionysius must have been made at Rome some time before Pope Hadrian. I may add that owing to the complete destruction of all the early libraries and archives of the Roman Church, manuscripts of indubitably Roman pedigree are rare: among all MSS of canons that I know (outside the Hadriana), the Freisingen MS, Monacensis lat. 6243, is the only one that I can confidently connect nearly with Rome, and that was actually written, it would seem, in Bavaria. On all grounds then the Petersburg MS deserves attention.

---

[1] See further references by Sirmond to his Lyons MS for Gallic councils in Rose, p. 169.

[2] The Clermont catalogue attributes all three portions of the MS to the eighth century; Gillert calls the Petersburg portion seventh century: Rose the Berlin portion seventh (seventh–eighth). The date can hardly, one would suppose, be far from A.D. 700. It may be added that the Petersburg MS has the preface of Dionysius, which it is a mark of the Hadriana edition to omit.

[3] Of course it is *possible* that the note *ex scrinio ecclesiae Romanae* was taken over

C. H. TURNER.

(*To be continued.*)

ON THE ITALIAN ORIGIN OF CODEX BEZAE.

I. CODEX BEZAE AND CODEX 1071.

IN Gregory's brief description of Cod. 1071, attention is called to some of its readings in the *Pericope Adulterae*, Jo. viii 6, 9. Further investigation of the whole passage on my visit to Athos last summer enabled me to establish the important fact that the text of the *Pericope* is essentially the same in 1071 as in D.

This may be seen from these facts.

There are the following variants found in D 1071 against all other MSS.

viii 3. *γυναῖκα ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ εἰλιμμένην.*
viii 4. *ἐκπειράζοντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἱερεῖς* (1071 *ἀρχιερεῖς*) *ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορίαν* (1071 *κατηγορεῖν*) *αὐτοῦ.*
viii 5. *Μωυσῆς δὲ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἐκέλευσεν* (1071 *διακελεύει*).
viii 6. *om.* *τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτὸν ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.* (264 omits this also, but has not the corresponding clause above.)
viii 9. *ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.*
viii 9. *om.* *εἷς καθ᾽ εἷς.*
viii 9. *ὥστε πάντας ἐξελθεῖν.*
viii 11. *κἀκείνη εἶπεν.*

from the exemplar of the Lyons MS, so that the point of contact with Rome would have been earlier than A. D. 700.

Besides these 1071 has four small variants unattested anywhere, one, viii 8, *κεκυφώς* for *κατακύψας* found in a few minuscles, and one, viii 11, *πορεύου*, agreeing with the T R against D *ὕπαγε*.

At what point in their respective histories or ancestries did the contact take place which resulted in this unique agreement in a single passage? To this question it seems that at least a probable answer can be given if the past of the two MSS is carefully sifted and investigated.

(i) CODEX BEZAE.

The Codex Bezae has been in Cambridge since it was presented to the University in 1581 by Theodore Beza the reformer. Beza had obtained it some years before in Lyons, as he has noted in the MS itself: *Est hoc exemplar uenerandae uetustatis ex Graecia, ut apparet ex barbaris Graecis quibusdam ad marginem adscriptis, olim exportatum et in S. Irenaei monasterio Lugduni ita ut hic cernitur mutilatum, postquam ibi in puluere diu iacuisset, repertum oriente ibi ciuili bello anno Domini* 1562. In plain language Beza means that it was part of the loot of the monastery: and therefore he had every motive to be reticent about the recent history of a MS which turns up so suspiciously in his possession. In any case, that he calls it *Lugdunensis*, or even that he found it in Lyons, proves nothing as to the length of time it had been there. But in the 1598 edition of the *Annotationes* he drops the name *Lugdunensis* and substitutes *Claromontanus*. It would be natural to see in this an assimilation, intentional or otherwise, to his real Claromontanus, the well-known D of St. Paul's Epistles, which is so called from Clermont near Beauvais, and has nothing in common, except the name, with the more famous Clermont in Auvergne.

But Marianus Victorius, bishop of Rieti in Italy, comments as follows on Jerome's tract, *contra Iovianum*: SI EVM SIC VOLO ESSE QVID AD TE? *D. Hieronimus legit, sicut habet antiquissimus quidam Graecus codex, quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis episcopus anno Domini* 1546 [so the second edition: the first, which is not in the Bodleian, appears to read 1549[1]] *ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως ἕως ἔρχομαι.* It has always been assumed that this MS must be the Codex Bezae, since no other Greek MS is known to have the reading; and an obvious explanation is given of Beza's name *Claromontanus*. The Codex was (it was said) at Trent in 1546 (William a Prato, bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, was not present at the council after 1547), returned thence with him to its home in France, and passed somehow to the neighbouring city of Lyons between 1547 and 1562.

Unfortunately this view clashes with the evidence of another witness.

---

[1] 1549 is an impossible date: see further on in the paragraph.

Robert Stephen, in his 1550 edition of the Greek Testament, quotes Codex Bezae or β′,—it is curious, and not creditable to Beza's perception, that he never recognized the identity of his *Lugdunensis* with Stephen's β′,—and says of it, τὸ δὲ β′ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀντιβληθὲν φίλων. And if it was brought to Trent to depose in favour of celibacy[1] (οὕτως, or *sic* = 'unmarried,' Jo. xxi 22), it is more likely to have been brought by Italian hands than by French.

Thus the evidence is clear that in the middle of the sixteenth century Codex Bezae was in Italy: there is nothing to show that it came there from France. And in any case there is nothing in what is known of Codex Bezae's history to stand in the way of the conclusion which the next section will suggest, namely, that Codex Bezae (or, less probably, a sister MS to it) was at or near Amalfi in the eleventh or twelfth century.

(ii) CODEX 1071.

It may be doubted whether any library in the world contains more Greek cursive manuscripts of the earliest periods than the library of the Laura on Mt. Athos.

But owing to various reasons, although there is an excellent and now almost complete catalogue made by the librarian, Father Chrysostom, the most learned and charming of Greek monks, no list of these MSS has as yet been published.

Among others there are more than 120 vellum codices of the gospels, of dates varying from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries. Of these only ten are mentioned by Gregory in his Prolegomena to Tischendorf, a fact which ceases to be surprising when one remembers that at the time of Gregory's visit the library was unarranged and uncatalogued.

Several of these Laura MSS are interesting, and many of them exceedingly beautiful, but none of them are equal in interest for the textual critic to Laurae A. 104, which is almost undoubtedly the one seen by Gregory and numbered by him 1071, though his measurements and mine differ by a few millimetres.

Gregory's description is as follows:—

'1071. in Atho Laurae; saec XII, 28·3 × 19·5 membr, coll. 2, ll. 26. 27, Carp. Eus.-t, capp.-t, capp, titl, sect. (M^{c}234: 16, 9) can, syn, men, subscr ut Ω, στιχ: *Evv*; L^{c} 22, 43. 44 deerat, m. ser. add. in mg.: Joh. 8, 6. κάτω κεκυφὼς τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραψεν: 8, 9. ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξήρχετο ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· ὥστε πάντας ἐξελθεῖν et multa alia. In Calabria nisi fallor exaratus, manibus duabus, partim litteris Neritinis[2]. Vidi 27 Aug. 1886.'

---

[1] The question of celibacy does not, however, appear to have been publicly discussed at the Council before 1563.

[2] By *litterae Neritinae* is meant the writing of the school of Nardo.

To this should be added that it contains also *lect. pict.* And for *duabus manibus* read *tribus manibus.* It contains 101 folia and the *στίχοι* are wanting in Luke and John.

Gregory suspected the handwriting to be of Western origin. But a convincing proof of this is to be found in the pictures, the existence of which he does not mention. They are unilluminated, but the few words which occur in them are Latin: e.g. in the picture of St. John, the apostle is holding a book on which is written, 'In principio erat verbum.' This seems to render an Italian origin almost certain, and a curious fact in the history of Mt. Athos, which I believe has not previously found its way into print, suggests that it was brought to Mt. Athos from Amalfi.

One of the most beautiful spots on that most beautiful mountain is on the road from the Laura to Ivéron, a wooded precipitous hill standing in the mouth of a ravine, crowned by a high ruined tower. It appears that this tower is all that now remains of a monastery called Morfinon, which was founded in the twelfth century as part of a movement of rapprochement between Constantinople and Italy, and colonised from Amalfi. It flourished for a time, but gradually decayed until at last it fell into ruins, and the Laura annexed its lands, or some of them, and took possession of its library.

It is natural to believe that 1071 was once part of this library, and that it was brought from Amalfi to Athos to stock the library of the Morfinon.

If this, however, were all we knew of the MS, it would be in the highest degree precarious to assert that Amalfi was the place whence it drew its text of the *Pericope adulterae,* which is, as I began by showing, the point of contact between D and 1071. But in fact we know a good deal more of the ancestry of 1071: for it is one of a well-marked family which possess in common not only a peculiar stichometry of the Gospels, but also a peculiar colophon: and a very brief investigation into the history of the family will warrant the conclusion that the *pericope adulterae* in the form given by 1071 is an insertion marking a late stage in the history of the text of that MS.

The colophon in question runs as follows: *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον ἐγράφη καὶ ἀντεβλήθη ἐκ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει ἀποκειμένων.* The stichometry is Matthew 2554, Mark 1590, Luke 2676, John 2210. The manuscripts which contain this subscription and stichometry are thirteen at least in number, and those whose history can be traced fall apparently into two groups, a Western and an Eastern. To the former belong, besides 1071: (i) 262, now in Paris and brought from Constantinople, but according to Gregory written in Italy in the tenth century; and (ii) 829, a twelfth-century MS now at Grotta Ferrata, but not written in the characteristic Grotta Ferrata hand. To the latter belong (i) Λ, and the other half of Λ, namely 566, both brought by Tischendorf from 'the East,' ninth century; (ii) 157, written for the Eastern Emperor in the first half of the twelfth century; (iii) 565, better known as 2^{pe}, ninth or tenth century, which came to light in Pontus.

The common text of these manuscripts goes back, as their colophon indicates, to an archetype on Mount Sinai[1], for the correction of which apparently MSS from Jerusalem were employed: perhaps we ought to read ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων for ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. Their respective peculiarities, on the other hand, will have accrued in the stages that elapsed after the spread of their type from Mt. Sinai; and what is peculiar to one alone of the Western group must have accrued after the type had begun to propagate itself in Italy. Since, therefore, the text of the *pericope adulterae* in 1071 is an isolated and unique feature, shared by no other member of the group, it cannot go far back, if at all, behind 1071 itself[2]; and the probability is therefore considerable that it was in or near Amalfi that the peculiar Bezan text of the *pericope* was incorporated from the manuscript that was to go to Cambridge into the manuscript that was to go to Mount Athos. What the stages were that intervened in the history of D between the eleventh or twelfth century and the middle of the sixteenth can only be conjectured: but it may be remarked that, according to the mediaeval story, another famous MS made its way northwards from the same quarter in the twelfth century, for the Pisans are said to have won from the sack of Amalfi the great codex of Justinian, which the Florentines in turn took from Pisa and have preserved to our own day.

K. Lake.

---

[1] The 'Holy Mountain' cannot, apparently, mean Jerusalem: there seems to be no evidence for the use of the phrase as a synonym for any monastery there. This point was urged on me very strongly by Father Chrysostom, and the fact that to a Greek monk the phrase does not mean Jerusalem is not without value. Nor is Athos, nowadays τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος *par excellence*, more suitable, for two reasons. (1) The monasteries there have each a proper name, and none of them would be correctly designated as τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος, without further qualification. (2) These subscriptions are found in a group of MSS, of which at least one (Λ) is of the ninth century, and the common archetype would probably be much older. But, as Father Chrysostom told us, the use of τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος for Athos is probably not found before the tenth century. Therefore τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος in these subscriptions must refer to Sinai, the other great 'Holy Mountain' of the Eastern Church.

[2] The stichometry is, in the case of St. Matthew's Gospel, practically identical with the ordinary reckoning; in the case of St. Mark just so much less (1590 to 1616) as to suggest the absence of the last twelve verses; in St. Luke the difference is greater (2676 to 2750), and not very easy to explain; in St. John, if we may allow ourselves the conjectural substitution of 2010 for 2210, the difference is again just so much (2010 to 2024) as would be satisfied by the absence of the *pericope* from the archetype, and there are marginal notes in several members of the group which support this suggestion.

2. THE MARGINAL NOTES OF LECTIONS.

The Editor has asked me to write a note on the marginal lectionary entries in Codex Bezae, in view of the use that has been made of them in the discussion of the origin and history of the MS. I use only Scrivener's collection of the notes, and have not seen the facsimile; but I do not gather that the facsimile throws any new light on the notes, unless in the way of slightly modifying the date of some of the handwritings, and this scarcely affects what I have to say. And the effect of what I have to say is, that I cannot see in the lectionary notes any sufficient ground, if indeed any ground at all, for connecting the MS with Gaul.

1. The system indicated is certainly that of the Byzantine mass-lessons, as Dr. Scrivener maintained. Dr. Rendel Harris[1] says that the matter is not so simple as Dr. Scrivener makes out. I venture to think it is more simple. For Dr. Scrivener scarcely does justice to his position in the form in which he has put his notes. If he had tabulated them more clearly, it would have been more obvious that the lessons indicated are the Byzantine series, incomplete certainly, and in some cases more or less divergent from the present lectionary, but quite unmistakable. They form a whole which, for the most part, is demonstrably Byzantine in detail and belongs to a well-known stage in the development of the lectionary. Out of some eighty lessons noted by the scribe L, only about half a dozen cannot be satisfactorily identified. It is true the lessons sometimes differ in length from those of the existing lectionary, and in some few cases lessons are ascribed to Sunday which in the current lectionary belong to Saturday, and *vice versa*; but if these are not, in some cases at least, merely scribal errors, they may well represent local differences of use, or only indicate that changes have been made in course of time. I do not think that the Byzantine lectionary and its history have been adequately studied, and consequently it is difficult, without disproportionate pains, to verify the history of a particular περικοπή. But anyhow, these few divergences are quite insufficient to affect the Byzantine character of the lectionary, while they are balanced by the occurrence of such complicated lessons as the combination Matt. xxvii 1–38 Luke xxiii 39–43 Matt. xxvii 38–61 for Good Friday[2] (vespers), and Acts xx 16 17 28–36[3] which is used on the Sunday after the Ascension. And again, if the Byzantine lectionary be examined from Whit Monday to the end of Lent (exclusive of the Great Week), during which period the synoptic Gospels are read, it is obvious at once that, while the Gospels are read 'in course,' the

---

[1] *A Study of Codex Bezae* (Texts and Studies, II i) pp. 12–15.

[2] Ff. 95 *b*, 99 *b*, 279 *b*.

[3] Ff. 500 *b*, 501 *b*, 502 *b*.

progression is not uniform: Saturday is often ahead of Sunday, and Friday of Saturday, while in some parts of the year St. Mark is read on the first five weekdays when St. Matthew or St. Luke is read on Saturday and Sunday. But if the table of lessons is distributed into three columns, and the Sunday lessons are put in one column, those of Saturday in another, and those of the rest of the week in the third, it will be found that the three columns are independent of one another, except in so far as they deliberately avoid overlapping for the most part, and in the two latter the progression is generally uniform: that is to say, the existing lectionary is a stratification of three several series of lessons, those of the Sundays being chosen on some principle which may not be always obvious, and those of the Saturdays and of the other weekdays forming two independent courses running through the books. On the other hand, in Eastertide, when St. John is read, there are only two series, that of the Sundays and that of the six weekdays, the latter being a 'course' fairly uniform in progression throughout. Hence it is clear that the lectionary is a growth; and that when the Saturdays throughout the year were added to the Sundays and provided with lessons, in Eastertide all the weekdays were so provided at the same time. The system was not completed until the thirteenth century; and in earlier lectionaries, such e. g. as, on the one hand, *Evst.* 60, to which Mr. Kenyon refers, and on the other the 'Jerusalem Syriac,' the Gospel lectionary of the Syriac-speaking Orthodox of Palestine, an intermediate stage in the development is represented; and while every day in Eastertide has its Gospel (from St. John) assigned to it, only Saturdays and Sundays are so supplied from Whit Monday to the end of Lent. Evidently, as might be surmised from the date of the scribes L and J, it is to this class that the lectionary of Codex Bezae belongs: in the synoptic Gospels Saturday and Sunday are marked, while in St. John there is no such distinction, but the lessons are only indicated by αναγνωσμα.

2. But Dr. Rendel Harris suggests four objections to the assignment of the marginal notes to the Byzantine system:—

(1) He remarks on 'a close connexion between the Greek and Gallican rituals,' as though this might account for the coincidences with the Byzantine lectionary. There certainly are such affinities; only I should be inclined perhaps to find closer affinities, at any rate in the matter of lectionaries, in other Gallican areas, like Spain and Milan, than in Gaul itself. But such fundamental connexions are quite inadequate to account for the developed systems of Bezan lessons, and the matter is really not worth discussion.

(2) Dr. Rendel Harris objects that the simplicity of the indications, merely by αναγνωσμα with or without the addition of περι του σαββατου or

περι του κυριακη, suggests that they do not refer to a complete and fixed system like the Byzantine, but rather to a Gallican system like that of the Bobbio Sacramentary, where there are lessons for a certain number of *missae dominicales*, not assigned to particular Sundays, but used to fill up unoccupied Sundays, and presumably repeated if necessary. But apart from the fact that in Codex Bezae there are too many lessons for such a system, since it would imply that two-thirds of the Sundays in the year were left, so far as the scribe L is concerned, in this promiscuous condition; and apart from the fact that Gallican lectionaries do not assign lessons to ordinary Saturdays; and again, apart from the fact that nearly all the lessons indicated are to be found in the existing Byzantine series—this objection betrays a certain want of imagination. The Byzantine lectionary is simple enough in principle, but by no means so simple in practice. In the use of any lectionary the adjustment of the system of movable feasts to immovables creates complication, and nowhere more than in the Byzantine system. And an inspection of the thirty-five tables of the Εὐαγγελιστάριον[1] will convince anybody of this. It is obvious that no mere marginal system could meet the needs of a reader: he would be bound to consult an index or table of lessons, which would refer him to some system of division of the text, such as the Ammonian sections (and it must be noted that when L inserted the lectionary notes in Codex Bezae, he added the Ammonian sections at the same time), and all he would need for convenience in the margin of his New Testament would be some indication of the ἀρχή and τέλος of the lesson, within the section. Anyhow, that is all, I believe, that is to be found in plenty of indisputably Byzantine texts.

(3) Dr. Rendel Harris further points out that, whereas the Gospel Jo. v 19 (f. 120 *b*) is labelled περι αναπαυσαμενων, Dr. Scrivener has only been able to identify it with Jo. v 17–24 of the Wednesday after Low Sunday; and he suggests that it is better identified with Jo. v 24–29 of the *missa sacerdotis defuncti* of the Bobbio Sacramentary. But Dr. Scrivener is at fault in his identification; in fact, Jo. v 24–30 is the Gospel at funerals in the Εὐχολόγιον; and it seems obvious that the Bezan lesson, of which no τέλος is marked, is to be carried on as far as *v.* 29 or 30, to make it quite adequate to the occasion; and that the lesson indicated is the present Byzantine lesson, with *vv.* 19–23

---

[1] It is a pity that textual critics have confused the terminology of lectionaries &c. They call a Gospel lectionary *Evangelistarium*, and a table of lessons *Synaxarion*; whereas, in fact, the Gospel book is called simply Εὐαγγέλιον in Greek and *Evangeliarium* in Latin, and the table of lessons is Εὐαγγελιστάριον, while Συναξάριον corresponds to *Martyrologium*. No doubt other uses occur—e. g. *Evangelistarium* seems to be found for *Evangeliarium*, and the transliteration *Sūnaksar* is apparently used for a lectionary in Syriac; but the above represents, I think, the normal use.

prefixed; and there is no phenomenon of liturgical growth commoner than the curtailment of lessons.

(4) But what Dr. Rendel Harris lays most stress upon is the note of the scribe J, who is anterior to L, at Jo. xii 1, *το κυριακη των προφȣτησματων* (f. 150 *b*). This is obviously to be amended *τῇ κ. τῶν προφωτισμάτων*, and the day referred to is confessedly Palm Sunday. Dr. Rendel Harris asserts summarily that a Greek scribe would have simply called the day *κυριακὴ τῶν βαΐων*, and he sets aside the fact that the note refers to the Byzantine Gospel for Palm Sunday (Jo. xii 1–18) by appealing to the 'occasional agreement between the Gallican and Greek systems'; and he further remarks that 'by this time,' the time that is of the scribe J, 'it is not likely that the Gallican use was still in force at Milan,' while the rest of Italy is assumed to be Roman, and therefore out of the question. Accordingly this note points to Gaul as the home of the MS in the ninth century. Now all this is precarious enough. It is perilous to be dogmatic as to what a Greek would call Palm Sunday; the variety of its names in the West might well warn us to be careful[1]. And the Gospel here marked does not stand quite alone: the immediately preceding notes (ff. 145 *b*, 148 *b*) indicate Jo. xi 1–45 as the Gospel of a *Saturday*; and whereas in Gallican systems this Gospel is assigned to a *Sunday* in Lent (Mozarab. 3rd, Ambrosian 5th), in the Byzantine lectionary it belongs to the *Saturday* before Palm Sunday, the 'Sabbath of Lazarus.' And so far is it from being true that the Gallican use was not in force at Milan in the ninth century, that the very use in question is still in force in the last year of the nineteenth century; the Saturday preceding Palm Sunday is still the *sabbatum in traditione symboli*, and its mass is in conformity with its title. Like other rites belonging to the vigil of Saturday-Sunday night—e.g. the Paschal rites and Ordinations—the *traditio* has been drawn back for convenience sake to the earlier hours of Saturday. At the same time the Gospel (Jo. xi 55–xii 11) still remains attached to Sunday; and if it be compared with the Mozarabic Jo. xi 55–xii 13, it will be seen that, by omitting the record of the Palm procession, it emphasizes the relation of the day to the coming baptisms; for the connexion between the *capitilavium* and the anointing of our Lord's head seems obvious. As to the rest of Italy, Gubbio in the fifth century was not Roman, but Gallican[2]; and the lectionaries of Naples (where the Gospel for Palm Sunday was again Jo. xii 1 sqq.) and of Capua show that Campania was not Roman in the seventh century[3]. And, in

---

[1] S. Isid. Hispal. *de Eccles. Off.* i 27 (repeated in Rab. Maur. *de Instit.* ii 35); Ps.-Alcuin *de div. Off.* 13 (Hittorp, p. 45).

[2] S. Innocent I *Ep.* 25 (Coustant, i p. 855 sqq.).

[3] Morin *Liber comicus* pp. 426 sqq., 436 sqq.

fact, it is at least probable that 'Gallican' simply means Western, and that the 'Gallican rite' is only the old Western rite out of which the local Roman rite developed itself, forming, as it were, an island in a Gallican sea, upon which it gradually, but only gradually, encroached by expansion; and it may not be easy in a given church to discover whether Roman or Gallican usage predominated at a given date. It is difficult to uproot usage; and, in fact, Gallican usage survived within the sphere of Roman influence, and reacted upon and transformed the Roman rite. It is quite possible, therefore, that any amount of Gallican usage survived in Italy in the ninth century and later, sufficient for Dr. Rendel Harris' purpose. But, in fact, there is no need to look in any Gallican direction for the explanation of τῇ κυριακῇ τῶν προφωτισμάτων: it lies where we might have expected it, in Byzantine usage. However little reference there may be in the modern Τυπικόν and Τριῴδιον to the great Easter baptisms, they of course belong as much to the Byzantine rite as to any other; while at this moment the ceremonial is nowhere more than a survival. The prayer for, and dismissal of, the *competentes* still exists in the Liturgy in Lent from the Wednesday after the third Sunday onwards. The seventy-eighth canon of the council *in Trullo*, of 692, legislates for the *redditio symboli* to be made τῇ πέμπτῃ τῆς ἑβδομάδος, i.e. presumably on Maundy Thursday; and in the last decade of the eighth century the Barberini Εὐχολόγιον gives the office of the final scrutiny on Good Friday[1]; the baptisms are implied in the court ceremonial described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus[2]; and Goar's MS *Cryptoferrat. Bessarionis*, apparently of about the eleventh century, has a baptismal order for use especially on the Great Sabbath[3]. But more than this, Palm Sunday used to be marked as a stage in the preparation of the competents. The sermon *de paschate et ss. eucharistia*, ascribed to St. Eutychius of Constantinople, says definitely of Palm Sunday, in which he of course includes the preceding Saturday night, τηνικαῦτα ποιοῦμεν τὰ προφωτίσματα[4]. Evidently there was a κατήχησις or *scrutinium* on that day, which explains the λόγοι εἰς τὰ προφωτίσματα, εἰς τὰ βάϊα καὶ εἰς τὴν ἔγερσιν τοῦ Λαζάρου to which Ducange refers as attributed to St. Proclus and Leontius (of Byzantium?) by some author unnamed[5]. And it accounts for the existing τρισάγιον of the mass, Ὅσοι εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, on the Saturday of Lazarus, and explains why the competents were not dismissed at the usual point in the Liturgy on that day[1]. Dr. Rendel Harris' contention therefore simply falls to the ground.

---

[1] Goar Εὐχολόγιον p. 279 (ed. 1730); Assemani *Cod. lit.* i p. 111.

[2] *De caerimoniis aulae byzantinae* i 12 (Migne *P. G.* cxii 305).

[3] Εὐχολόγιον p. 292.

[4] Migne *P. G.* lxxxvi 2392; with the curious reference to the 'first supper' cf. St. Theodore Stud. *Catech. chronica* 9 (*ib.* xcix 1700).

[5] *Glossar. med. et inf. graec.* s.v. φώτισμα.

3. But Dr. Scrivener contributes another argument. He points out that the three Saints' days which are explicitly named in the Bezan margin are the Assumption, in a hand of the tenth century (f. 229 *b*), and St. George and St. Dionysius the Areopagite, in a hand of the twelfth century (ff. 462 *b*, 488 *b*); and he remarks that these 'are just such as would be specially regarded in the West at their respective dates,' SS. George and Denys being respectively 'the patron saints of England and France' (p. xxxi). I do not understand that there is any question but that the MS belongs to the West, so that in any case this has little importance. But I do not see that these entries point either to the West in general or to Gaul in particular. An emphasis on the B.V.M. would *prima facie* suggest Byzantium and the East rather than a Latin atmosphere. And surely there is no saint more popular everywhere than St. George; and that, earlier in the East than in the West. Dr. Scrivener himself remarks that his later prominence in the West was due to the Crusades. If he was the patron of England—and it was not till the thirteenth century that he was formally so acknowledged—he was also the protector of the Byzantine Empire, especially in its relations with the Saracens; and for centuries he has been commemorated in the prothesis at every Byzantine mass. St. Denys might no doubt suggest connexions with Gaul; the Dionysian legend, which identified the Apostle of Gaul with the Areopagite, was already accepted in the ninth century. But, on the other hand, he was not forgotten in his own eastern world. And, anyhow, the conditions might just as well be satisfied elsewhere, e.g. in Southern Italy. Of the names under which the Basilian monasteries of Southern Italy were dedicated, the most predominant was that of the Blessed Virgin; and there were three monasteries under the name of St. George, to four under that of St. Basil, the founder of the order[2]. And while St. Denys does not appear to have had any monasteries dedicated under his name, one of the churches belonging to St. Mary of Rossano was St. Dionysius de Casubono[3]; and MS *Vatic.* 1456, which came from St. Mary of Rossano, has a folio inserted in it containing the 'Απόστολος of St. Dionysius, Acts xvii 16 sqq.[4]

4. Mr. Kenyon (*J. T. S.*, January 1900, p. 297) remarks that in S. Gaul 'Greek liturgical uses continued far into the Middle Ages,' and that 'at least one Greek lectionary is known to have been written' for it 'as late

---

[1] See MS B. M. *Add.* 22749, quoted by Swainson, *Greek Liturgies* p. 180 note d, where for λαβαροῦ read Λαζάρου.

[2] See the list in Batiffol *L'abbaye de Rossano* pp. 181 sq.

[3] *Ib.* p. 20.

[4] *Ib.* p. 65.

as the year 1022 (*Evst.* 60).' Now, of course, as Mr. Kenyon further notices, the beginnings of Gallic Christianity as we know them are Greek; they are represented by St. Pothinus and St. Irenaeus, and the *Letter of Lyons and Vienne.* But this no more proves that the Gallic Church continued to be Greek or half Greek than that the Greek beginnings of the Roman Church continued to interfere with its thoroughly Latin character. If a continuous and influential Greek tradition can be shown on other grounds to have existed, the Greek origins would account for it; but the Greek origins cannot prove the existence of the tradition. It is true again, I believe, that there was considerable intercourse between Marseilles and the Eastern Mediterranean in the fourth and fifth centuries; and through Cassian, especially, eastern monasticism was transplanted into Gaul. But so far as I know, there is no Gallic Greek writer; St. Hilary and Cassian are Latin enough for any purpose. It is true also that there was a Greek population in Arles in the sixth century: it is related that St. Caesarius took measures to provide his congregation with hymns, both Greek and Latin, that they might not have leisure to chatter in church[1]. But this does not prove that there was a Greek rite in Arles, but rather the contrary. The patristic preachers constantly complain of the misbehaviour of congregations—St. Chrysostom at Antioch, and St. Ambrose at Milan, and St. Caesarius at Arles—and one can well imagine that chattering Greeks at Arles, assisting at a Latin rite which they did not fully understand, were especially trying. Anyhow, no one can suppose that St. Caesarius sang mass in Greek. Dr. Rendel Harris quotes from St. Gregory of Tours notices of Syrians in Gaul, even in Paris, who were probably Greeks: a certain Syrian became bishop of Paris. But this no more suggests the existence of a Greek rite in Gaul than the archiepiscopate of Theodore of Tarsus suggests a Greek rite in England. It is true that in the sixth century there were Greek elements in the otherwise Latin rite of Gaul; and there were coincidences in usage—e. g. in the matter of the ecclesiastical vestments: Gallican bishops all wore the pallium, and all priests wore armlets (manicae, ἐπιμανίκια)—which suggest Byzantine influence[2]. But where these were not merely matters of ceremonial, they were merely isolated elements—the use of *Kyrieleison* and the *trisagion* in Greek; they did not imply a Greek or a Byzantine rite, and were not survivals, except perhaps the *Kyrieleison.* The same was, and is to some extent, the case at Rome, where the Greek formulae were probably not survivals, but the effect of the existence of the Empire and Exarchate, and perhaps of the desire to express the unity of the Church. Otherwise, so far as I know, there is no trace of a Greek rite to be found in Gaul in this period. But from the ninth century onwards there are larger Greek elements to be found here and there in the mass in Gaul[1]. The *Gloria in excelsis*, the *Credo*, the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus* were sung in Greek in some churches; and at St. Denys, on the octave of the patronal festival, the mass was sung in Greek up to the time of the suppression of the house at the Revolution; and, as Mr. Kenyon points out, at least one Byzantine Evangeliarium was written in France, in 1022. But there is no reason to suppose that all this represents a Greek tradition; it was rather the outcome of a more or less dilettante Greek scholarship, encouraged no doubt by the Dionysian legend. If it means a Greek tradition in Gaul, why does it not also represent a Greek tradition in England; for they did the same at Canterbury and at Winchester[2]? At St. Denys it was not the Greek liturgy that was sung, but only a translation of the Roman; and it began there, as elsewhere, with the *Gloria in excelsis* and the *Credo*, and it was only gradually that other parts of the mass were added; and it was only the audible parts of the mass that were ever in Greek: the canon and all that was inaudible remained in Latin to the end[3]. As to *Evst.* 60, according to its colophon, it was written by one Elias τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ μοναχοῦ σπηλαιώτου at 'castrum de Colonia' (ἐν . . . Κάστρο δεκολωνίας) in France; and according to other entries it belonged, at least soon after its production, to the monastery of St. Denys, and accordingly it has the Epistle for St. Denys' Day, Acts xvii 22 sqq., written in an eleventh-century hand on the last leaf but one[4]. If Montfaucon is right in his identification of 'castrum de Colonia,' this was somewhere near Le Mans; so that the MS does not belong to Southern Gaul at all. From the name of the scribe, I should conjecture that he was a Calabrian, belonging to the foundation of his great namesake, St. Elias the Speliote, one of the heroes of Basilian monasticism in Calabria in the beginning of the tenth century[5], whose name has fixed itself on several spots in the toe of Italy and in Sicily. It seems, therefore, not unnatural to suppose that the scribe was a visitor, who copied his Εὐαγγέλιον for the monks of St. Denys to satisfy their philological interest in their supposed patron; and in that case the Evangeliary has no significance for the purpose in hand. And it remains to be proved that there existed in Gaul at any time the conditions to which the Byzantine lectionary of Codex Bezae could have any practical relations.

---

[1] Cyprian *Vita S. Caesarii* i 2, § 15 (Migne *P. L.* lxvii 1008).

[2] See St. German of Paris *Epp.* i and ii (Migne *P. L.* lxxii 89); *Conc. Matiscon.* i can. 6 (where *episcopus* is the right reading).

---

[1] See Frere *The Winchester Troper* p. xxvi.

[2] See W. Chappell in *Archaeologia* xlvi; Frere *Winchester Troper* pp. 24, 60, 97.

[3] See an account of the St. Denys MSS, Bibl. Nationale 4*to Lat.* 2290, 9387 and 9436, in Vincent *Note sur la messe grecque qui se chantait autrefois à l'Abbaye royale de Saint-Denys*, Paris 1864, pp. 12 sqq.

[4] Montfaucon *Palaeog. graeca* p. 292; Valesius *Notitia Galliarum* s. v. *Colonia villa.*

[5] *Acta SS.* Sept. iii, pp. 843 sqq.; cf. Batiffol *L'Abbaye de Rossano* p. xiv.

5. In Southern Italy, on the other hand, such conditions may be found. From the seventh century onwards, as a result of the Moslem conquests in the Levant, and the consequent flight of a large Greek population, Sicily, and when Sicily fell before the conquering Saracens, Calabria and Apulia, became largely Greek. And from the reign of Leo the Isaurian to the Norman Conquest, Calabria, and with the extension of effective Byzantine power Apulia and the Basilicata, belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople[1]. Its ecclesiology and its rite were Byzantine; and the interior of the toe and heel of Italy at this moment continues to be Greek in rite as in speech[2]. And outside of these, as far at least as Monte Cassino, Greek elements existed, incorporated in the Latin rite. Possibly the so-called Liturgy of St. Peter, a 'conflate' of the Byzantine and Roman rites, in Greek, is not a mere literary curiosity, but represents a serious attempt to combine the two rites[3]; while in the monuments of the Greek rite of Southern Italy there is a Roman infusion[4]. The monastery of Grotta Ferrata, in the Alban Hills, with its Byzantine rite, is a direct descendant of the Basilian monasticism of Calabria[5], and represents the history of the Greek population after the schism of East and West; for they became 'Uniats,' remaining in the Roman communion, while retaining their Greek rite. We have here, therefore, the conditions to which the Bezan lectionary might have real relations—a mixed Greek and Latin population, in which the Greek element was of the Byzantine rite.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

---

[1] Batiffol *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, Introduction.

[2] Batiffol, pp. xi sqq.; Rodotà *Dell' origine, progresso e stato presente dell' rito greco in Italia*, Rome 1758–63; Mr. H. F. Tozer in *Antiquary*, Aug. 1883, Oct., Nov. 1888, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Oct. 1889; and *Litt. E. and W.* pp. lxxxv, xc sq.

[3] Printed in Swainson *Greek Liturgies* pp. 191 sqq.; cf. *Litt. E. and W.* p. xci.

[4] See *variae lectiones* in Goar Εὐχολόγιον; and those of the Rossano MS in Swainson, pp. 101 sqq.

[5] Rocchi *La Badia di Grottaferrata*, Rome 1884.

REVIEWS

KOETSCHAU'S EDITION OF ORIGEN.

Origenes' Werke: erster Band, die Schrift vom Martyrium, Buch I–IV gegen Celsus; zweiter Band, Buch V–VIII gegen Celsus, die Schrift vom Gebet; herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, von Dr. PAUL KOETSCHAU, Professor am Grossherzogl. Gymnasium in Jena. (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899.)

THESE two volumes, the first instalment of the Berlin edition of Origen's works, show clearly that Dr. Koetschau has spared neither time nor trouble in preparing for and carrying out a difficult and arduous task. The introductions on the different writings are clearly and concisely written, and supply just the information which is needed. The *apparatus criticus* is sufficiently full, without being overburdened with unnecessary details, and is, as far as it is possible to judge, accurate. The text is well printed (except that rather more breathings and accents have fallen out than is quite creditable to the printers), and the references to Delarue's pages, and, where passages of the *c. Celsum* are contained in the 'Philocalia,' to the pages of Robinson's edition, are clearly and conveniently given. The indices of passages quoted, both from sacred and profane authors, of proper names, and of Greek words, are very copious. In fact, as far as external form is concerned, this edition is all that can be wished. But has the editor given it that which alone can enable a book to live and last, that which only an almost unerring critical judgement can supply? This is the vital question which is raised by Dr. P. Wendland's vehement and, to our English ideas, unmannerly attack on Koetschau in a review of his book in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (April, 1899, pp. 276–304). Some of his criticisms, though justified, hardly affect the value of the book: it is true that the sections of the introduction to the *c. Celsum* which deal with Origen's knowledge of Greek literature and antiquities, of the Bible and early Christian writings, and those which give a sketch of his relation to Greek Philosophy and of his theological system, are not likely to be of much use to those who would use this edition; it is a pity that an index of the passages of profane authors actually quoted or referred to by Origen himself did not take the place of the long list in which they are hopelessly mixed up with passages referred to in illustration of his words; it is not surprising that no two men should agree as to what words should be included in the *index Graecitatis*, or what variants and emendations should be included in the critical notes; but these are in a sense trifling defects. But when at the end of a review, which shows that the reviewer has gone most carefully through the entire book, we find the final judgement given in the words 'in all that concerns anything beyond merely mechanical work, the very little that is good is far outweighed by the mass of mistakes, misunderstandings, and pieces of carelessness'—then we are compelled to say that if this judgement is justified it would have been better if the book had never been published. Patristic students know only too well from the case of Dindorf's *Clement of Alexandria* the harm which a mediocre edition of an author can do. But Koetschau has shown, in a detailed reply to Wendland's criticisms[1], that he is by no means so deficient in critical acumen and knowledge of Origen's language as his critic has assumed. Without doubt, as Koetschau frankly admits, in many cases Wendland's corrections and suggestions are right, in others it is very difficult to decide; but there are a considerable number in which Koetschau is no doubt right, and naturally Wendland's emendations do not seem so convincing to another as to himself. Wendland hopes (p. 295) to have time to publish a new edition at all events of the *c. Celsum*; if so, may he be large-minded enough to learn some things from Koetschau's answer to his criticisms.

One main question in dispute between the two is the weight to be assigned to the *Philocalia* text in those passages of the *c. Celsum* which are preserved in it. Of both these works there are numerous MSS, which appear to have been reduced to perfect order by the labours of Canon Armitage Robinson and Koetschau. These two scholars worked independently, and published their results almost simultaneously, the former in the *Journal of Philology* (vol. xviii, no. 35), the latter in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* series[2]. As regards the *Philocalia*, their conclusions were practically identical, and Robinson's text[3] is accepted by Wendland also as satisfactory. But for the *c. Celsum*, Koetschau maintained that Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 616 (= P) was independent of Vaticanus 386 (= A Koetschau, ℵ Robinson): in the introduction, however, to the present work he prints a communication sent to him by Dr. K. J. Neumann, in which it is conclusively proved that P is a copy of A, and this result Koetschau accepts. There is therefore only one authority for the greater part of the text of the *c. Celsum.* But about a seventh part of this work is also preserved in the *Philocalia.* Robinson and Koetschau consider that the text of A is superior to that of the *Philocalia*, and the agreement of these two editors, working from different sides, must carry very great weight. But their opinion is strenuously opposed by Wendland, who strongly maintains the superiority of the *Philocalia* text. To decide finally between these two views would require an amount of work almost equal to editing the passages concerned. I have carefully considered forty-five of the readings criticized by Wendland; in five places he is undoubtedly right (as Koetschau admits in two of them); in fifteen I think Koetschau's view the better; while the other cases are such that it is difficult to form a decided opinion. There can be little doubt that A on the whole preserves the better text, though more use might have been made of the help afforded by the *Philocalia.*

---

[1] *Kritische Bemerkungen zu meiner Ausgabe von Origenes' Exhortatio u.s.w.* Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899.

[2] *Die Textüberlieferung der Bücher des Origenes gegen Celsus in den Handschriften dieses Werkes und der Philocalia*: Texte u. Unters. VI i, Leipzig, 1889.

[3] *The Philocalia of Origen.* Cambridge, 1893.

In one matter, however, Koetschau has incurred Wendland's displeasure for following the *Philocalia.* In chap. xv of that work *c. Celsum* vi §§ 75–77 is given; in § 77, near the beginning, three passages from *c. Celsum* i and ii are inserted, then § 77 is carried on again; but a passage on the mystical meaning of *τὰ ἱμάτια τοῦ λόγου* is inserted there which is not found in the present text of the *c. Celsum.* Koetschau thinks that this passage has dropped out from an ancestor of A owing to the loss of a leaf containing it, and prints it in his text. Wendland considers it out of place there, and believes that the editors of the *Philocalia* took it from some other work of Origen's, and inserted it in the middle of this section, and suggests that it really comes from one of the lost homilies on Matthew or Luke: this suggestion is hardly a happy one, for the passage contains the sentence *ὅρα δὲ εἰ μὴ ὅμοιόν ἐστι καὶ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος μαθεῖν*, which would not be in place in a work dealing with one of the Gospels. He is no doubt right in saying that it is unlikely that the sense should have begun and ended with a page, but it is only necessary to turn over the pages of a book to see that it is at all events possible. The summary which he gives of §§ 75–77 in order to show that the passage in question is out of place there does not carry much weight, for it omits the thoughts which do seem to imply a connexion. The *Philocalia* affords *prima facie* evidence that this passage did stand in this section of the *c. Celsum*, and Koetschau is right to print it there unless *proof* to the contrary can be given.

No one could wish for a pleasanter task than that which has fallen to

Koetschau's lot in editing the *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*. For the first time the complete text of this beautiful little work is given in print. The *editio princeps*, on which subsequent editions were based, was not too carefully printed from a sixteenth-century copy (Basiliensis 31) of Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 616 (= P). The only other MS known is Venetus Marcianus 45 (= M). Omissions in each of these two MSS show that neither was copied from the other, but they are fairly closely related: both contain also the Panegyric of Gregory Thaumaturgus on Origen and the *c. Celsum*, and as it is now admitted that both copied these works from Vaticanus 386 (= A), Koetschau's conjecture that this MS, now imperfect, once contained the *Exhortatio*, and that P and M were copied from it, is rendered a practical certainty. It does not speak well for Koetschau's critical sharpness that although he has always held that M copied the Panegyric and the *c. Celsum* from A, and admitted the same as regards P in 1894 (in his edition of the Panegyric), yet the bearing of this on his conjecture does not seem to have struck him till he was answering Wendland's criticisms.

Thus the *Exhortatio*, and the *c. Celsum* passages which are also contained in the *Philocalia*, present the same textual problem, to construct a text from two authorities, and it is therefore doubly interesting to see how Koetschau succeeds in the case of the short tract, about which it is easier to form an opinion. He considers, rightly I think, that M preserves the more trustworthy text; but I add the following instances to those noticed by Wendland, in which it may reasonably be questioned whether he is right in preferring its readings:—

p. 3, l. 6. Ἀμβρόσιε θεοσεβέστατε καὶ Πρωτόκτητε εὐσεβέστατε Koetschau with M; for the spaced word P has θεοπρεπέστατε: this is a good word, but far more likely to be altered than θεοσεβέστατε, especially with εὐσεβέστατε following. Cp. Clem. Al. *Strom.* VII i 3 (Potter 830).

p. 4, l. 8. βάρος αἰωνίου δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν Koetschau with M: αἰώνιον P, the only reading in 2 Cor. iv 17, and which Koetschau prints with M P on p. 46, l. 17, where the quotation is again made.

p. 4, l. 30. ῥυσθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου Koetschau with M: ἐκ P. In two other places in the section both MSS have ἐκ, which, when the ε is represented by a simple curve before the κ, might easily be mistaken for the tachygraphical sign for ἀπό.

p. 6, l. 20. οἱ δικαίως ζῆν προτεθειμένοι Koetschau with M: P has προτεθυμημένοι, but υ over erasure, and μη added at end of line. According to Koetschau's conjecture (Introd. p. xxi) M was copied from A later than P, and in the meantime the state of preservation of A had rather rapidly got worse: in his 'Textüberlieferung' (p. 34) he says that the bombycine paper on which A is written is damp-stained in the margins especially. It is therefore not impossible that the scribe of P corrected what he first wrote in accordance with a marginal note which was illegible when M was copied.

Most of the notes in the margin of M are, according to Koetschau, in the hand of Cardinal Bessarion; unfortunately no help is given us for identifying them. One excellent emendation of the corrector of M (p. 19, l. 9 δὲ μόνον for δαιμόνων) was also made in the *editio princeps*, and so has found a place in the usual text. Koetschau has spoilt the following sentence by reading ἤ with MSS before γυμνῇ instead of οἱ with M², which necessitates his putting a comma after τύπων :—

p. 13, ll. 13–15. οἱ γὰρ φίλοι ἐν εἴδει καὶ οὐ δι’ αἰνιγμάτων μανθάνουσιν, οἱ γυμνῇ σοφίᾳ φωνῶν καὶ λέξεων καὶ συμβόλων καὶ τύπων προσβάλλοντες τῇ τῶν νοητῶν φύσει καὶ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κάλλει.

In two cases at least he should have followed the correction of the first hand of M :—

p. 3, ll. 10–13. Both MSS have ὁ δὲ μὴ ἀπωθούμενος τὴν ἐπὶ θλίψει (*om.* ἐπὶ θλ. M) θλῖψιν, ἀλλ’ ὡς γενναῖος ἀθλητὴς αὐτὴν προσδεχόμενος εὐθέως προσδέχεται καὶ ἐλπίδα ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι, ἧς μετ’ οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι θλίψεως ἀπολαύσει. Here Koetschau spoils the sense by reading ἐπὶ θλίψει for ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι, instead of accepting the marginal note of M¹ ἐλπίδος for θλίψεως.

p. 44, ll. 11 f. Both MSS originally had ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τὸ μὴ πεσεῖν ἀλλὰ μηδὲ σαλευθῆναι τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν οἰκίαν κτέ. Koetschau inserts μόνον after the first μὴ, instead of adopting the simple correction of M¹ δὴ for μή.

It is easy to pick out passages which will hardly give sense as they stand consistently with grammatical laws: cp. p. 5, ll. 25 ff. (κἄν with optative, and ἵνα ἔχωμεν apparently without any construction); p. 14, ll. 5 ff. (perhaps read πλείονος ἢ ὁποίαν ἕξεις καὶ σύ for πλείονος· ἐν ὁποίῳ ἔσῃ καὶ σύ: Koetschau's suggestion ἐν ὁποίοις, referring to ὀλίγοι in a previous line, does not improve matters, for the sense required is 'few men have ever had a chance of obtaining so much blessedness as thou'); p. 22, ll. 18 f. (read κολοῦον with Delarue).

But these matters are mere trifles compared with the way in which Koetschau has garbled the text of quotations from the New Testament in this particular tract. As he considers M the better MS, he should hold to it in Biblical quotations unless there is some very good reason to the contrary; the following examples will show that he prefers now one MS, now the other, and at times deserts both for no particular reason :—

p. 25, ll. 28 f. (Mc. xiv 36). M has ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, δυνατὰ πάντα σοι, as have D *a i* in Mc. Koetschau reads with P δυνατά σοι πάντα. In this case both readings are of interest, and it matters little which is in the text, but why prefer P to M?

p. 29, l. 12 (Mt. x 19). Both MSS have παραδώσουσιν, an interesting reading preserved in Mt. by D L X 33 *a b c ff h m q* vg: Koetschau prints παραδῶσιν.

p. 29, l. 13. Continuing the same quotation Origen agrees with D L *k* in omitting the words δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε. Against the authority of both his MSS, Koetschau inserts this sentence, and is so pleased with himself for so doing that on p. xix of his introduction he gives the omission of it as an instance of common error in M and P! Again, in line 16, M has ἐπαναστήσεται, the reading of B Δ in Mt.: Koetschau prints ἐπαναστήσονται with P.

p. 29, ll. 28 f. (Lc. xxi 16). M has καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ φίλων καὶ συγγενῶν, an order for which Tischendorf quotes no evidence: P has καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων καὶ ἀδελφῶν with a Syrian text. Koetschau prints the ordinary text.

p. 41, ll. 6 f. (Heb. x 34). Both MSS have καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς συνεπαθήσατε; M^2 adds μοῦ above the line after τοῖς, and so Koetschau prints. Obviously we should read τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε as do A D* 67** vg, &c., in the epistle.

These are only some of the cases I have noticed of the falsification of quotations from the New Testament. In the introduction we are told truly enough that the *Exhortatio* is of importance for the textual criticism of the Bible on account of the numerous quotations it contains. Textual criticism, however, is not much aided by a system of editing patristic works which banishes to the footnotes the evidence for important and interesting readings.

The *de Oratione* presents quite a different problem to an editor. There is only one MS, and the chief difficulty consists in sorting out the numerous emendations of Bentley and an anonymous Englishman whose notes were published in Reading's edition (London, 1728). In doing this Koetschau has shown, on the whole, good judgement, and if he is in this particular tract a little too conservative, it is a good fault. Dr. E. Klostermann has contributed some valuable suggestions. One of these the editor appears not to have understood properly. On p. 333 in the footnote to line 14 we read: '⟨ἄλλοις⟩ ἀνθρώποις schreibe ich nach E. Klostermann, der $\overline{\text{ΑΝΟΙΣ}}$ als Schreibfehler für ΑΛΛΟΙΣ ansieht.' All that is required to restore the sense of the passage is to substitute the latter word for the former; the passage then runs as follows:—

p. 333, ll. 11–14. δέησιν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐκ ἄτοπον καὶ ἀνθρώποις προσενεγκεῖν· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν δύο (λέγω δὴ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν) οὐ μόνον ἁγίοις ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ἄλλοις (MS ἀνθρώποις), τὴν δὲ δέησιν μόνον ἁγίοις κτέ. This gives a perfect sense. Koetschau quite needlessly inserts ἁγίοις before προσενεγκεῖν and lower down has ⟨ἄλλοις⟩ ἀνθρώποις.

On page 330, ll. 3–5, I should suggest ὅπερ παντί τῳ κατορθοῦται ἀεί, διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς λαμβανόντων (Koetschau with MS λαμβάνοντι) τὸν ὑετὸν τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν πρότερον αὐτοῦ ἐστερημένων.

On page 345, ll. 7–10, Koetschau, following Delarue, gives us a sentence which will tax most readers' ingenuity to the uttermost. I propose to read as follows: *ὁ μέντοι βαττολογῶν ἐν τῷ εὔχεσθαι ἤδη καὶ ἔν τῳ* (MS *ἐν τῷ*) *χείρονι τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῖν συναγωγικῶν* (so *edd.*: MS *-ικῶς*) *ἐστὶ καταστάσει, χαλεπωτέρᾳ τε* (MS *τε χαλεπωτέρᾳ*) *τῶν ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις γωνιῶν ὁδῷ, οὐδὲ ἴχνος σῴζων κἂν ὑποκρίσεως ἀγαθοῦ.* Origen is referring to Mt. vi 5 which he has previously quoted, and the sense of the passage is 'he who babbles in praying is already even in some worse position than the synagogue frequenters we have referred to, and on a harder road than the corners of streets.' Koetschau reads *ἐν τῇ . . . συναγωκικῇ ἐστι καταστάσει τε καὶ χαλεπωτέρᾳ κτέ.*

Lovers of Origen will be thankful for the considerable help afforded to them by these volumes; but we must frankly confess that their chief value is that they will lighten the labours of whoever is to prepare a really satisfactory edition of these works.

P. Mordaunt Barnard.

TWO BOOKS ON MYSTICISM.

Christian Mysticism: The Bampton Lectures for 1899. By W. R. Inge, M.A., Fellow of Hertford College. (Methuen & Co., 1899.)

Unity in Diversity: five addresses delivered in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, during Lent, 1899. By Charles Bigg, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1899.)

Until the other day the English reader who wished for a general account of Christian mysticism in his own language had to be content with Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics.* In the Bampton Lectures for 1899 Mr. Inge has superseded that work—whose genuine merits and glaring defects he excellently summarizes on pp. 347, 348—by one dealing with the same subject, but far the superior of its predecessor in seriousness of thought, reverence of tone, and dignity of style.

In reviewing a work on Christian Mysticism it is inevitable that we should ask at the outset what the author means by Mysticism. Few words are more variously or more vaguely used, and nothing would be more welcome to the student of philosophy and theology than a definition which would really apply to all those whose claim to the name no one disputes, and at the same time would clearly indicate what it is which is common to them and distinguishes them from others to whom the name would less readily be given. That Mr. Inge has done this, however, it is impossible to allow. He has collected in an Appendix a number of definitions of Mysticism by previous writers. This

Appendix, by the way, would be far more useful than it is, were the full references to the somewhat oddly arranged quotations added; and it may be said at once here, that the absence of references is a grave defect in Mr. Inge's book as a whole. He has, moreover, given two definitions of his own on p. 5. These two definitions, though Mr. Inge appears to regard them as differing only verbally from one another, are in fact by no means identical in meaning; and neither of them is free from obscurity. The second, which runs thus, 'the attempt to realize, in thought and feeling, the immanence of the temporal in the eternal, and of the eternal in the temporal,' provokes the inquiry—by no means unimportant—whether an 'attempt to realize' this in thought, but not in feeling—or in feeling, but not in thought—would be called by Mr. Inge Mysticism; whether if realization *in thought* is essential, ecstasy would not be excluded; or if realization *in feeling*, apart from thought, is sufficient, whether realization *in thought*, apart from feeling, would be sufficient also. The answers given to these questions could not but profoundly affect the treatment of the subject. Again, the first definition, which is thus stated, 'the attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and in nature,' can scarcely be treated as merely equivalent to the second. *Must* 'the eternal' be conceived of as a 'living God'? is the antithesis of 'soul' and 'nature' within 'the temporal' necessary to Mysticism?

Were I myself writing a book on Mysticism, I might, no doubt, be asked to frame a better definition; but it is the privilege of a reviewer to point out defects in what he reviews without being bound to amend them; and in this privilege (which makes my task much easier) I intend to take refuge.

Mysticism would seem to be hard to define, largely because it is an ambiguous term. It may be the name of a temperament, of a side or aspect of thought, or, again, of a philosophical system. We may neglect the unprofitable and inaccurate uses of the word by authors who use it where 'religion,' or where 'magic' would do as well. A theory of the world may fairly be called Mysticism, in which the ultimate truth and reality of things is held to be a unity, the consciousness of which is attainable as a feeling inexpressible by thought. Such a theory will be held by persons who have felt such a consciousness attained, or on the way to be attained, in their own experience. But this experience can exist, where the temperament which renders it possible is present, without leading to the explicit statement of a theory suggested by it: and great philosophers or great poets may understand and divine, or even share, such an experience, may call it as a witness to some truth of which it has a presentiment, or may describe it in verse, and yet not be adequately described as Mystics themselves. To Plato, despite the frequent use of his name by mystics, the term Mystic is quite inappropriate. For him the philosopher's inspiration is above the obscure presentiments of the prophet's ; comparison with the *Republic*, even careful consideration of the *Phaedrus* itself, shows that the expressions of the latter dialogue must not be taken as literally as might be the case with a less profoundly humorous author than Plato. If, again, Plato speaks elsewhere of the supreme unity as transcending knowledge and being, what he indicates by such language is that the contrast of knowing and being presupposes a unity within which the contrast falls, rather than that the opposition is to vanish in an ecstatic apprehension of that unity, other and higher than apprehension by reason. Hegel, again, is not a mystic, in spite of his willing recognition of the testimony borne by mystics to the truth that the distinctions of the abstract understanding were not absolute. Least of all men did he look on an immediate apprehension as higher than a mediate, than one thought out. What God gave to His beloved in sleep, he significantly said, was mostly dreams. But if it would be misleading to call Plato and Hegel mystics, still less, perhaps, is there any propriety in applying the name to such writers as the Cambridge Platonists, whom, nevertheless, Mr. Inge regards as the very flower of English mysticism. Here Vaughan, who will go no further than to admit that 'a vein of mysticism peeps out here and there in their writings' (*Hours with the Mystics* p. 315), seems to judge more truly than Mr. Inge. The Cambridge Platonists were men who united an idealistic philosophy with deep personal piety ; and in the case of Henry More, also with a love of the fantastic and the supernatural, which only a very low conception of what mysticism means—a conception as far as possible removed from Mr. Inge's—would consider as giving any claim to the name. Mr. Inge is not usually inclined, when he finds a spirit of inward devoutness, straightway to call it mystical—thus he has some excellent remarks (p. 194) on the *Imitation of Christ* as 'not, properly speaking, a mystical treatise'—but he is perhaps more ready to find mysticism wherever he finds idealistic philosophy. Would he call Thomas Hill Green a mystic ? He was surely as much so as Whichcote or John Smith. And it is difficult to suppose that even the temperament of the mystic can be rightly attributed to Henry More, who reckons up the essential mystical theologumena among the ravings of enthusiasm, and as no whit more important than the notions peculiar to Behmen's cosmology with which he associates them (*Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* § lxiv). No true mystic could have thus treated the expressions, 'That all is God's self,' 'That man's self is God, if he live holily' ; although he might have taken exception to the wording. More's respect for Behmen's personal character cannot counterbalance this. It is significant that he was more inclined to see inspiration in Descartes (one of the least mystical of thinkers) than in Behmen (*Defence of the Philosophick Cabbala*, Appendix, c. 1). His affinities with Behmen, if he has any, are to be sought elsewhere; namely, in the external resemblance between the mythological form in which Behmen presented his genuinely mystical apprehensions, and the very unmystical particularity with which More delights to describe the spirit-world, as existing not so much within as side by side with that of which our senses give us cognisance, and which the natural sciences explore. It is all the more strange that Mr. Inge should have gone to the Cambridge Platonists for the finest examples of *Christian* mysticism, when the Neoplatonic phraseology, the frequent use of which by them seems to have suggested the ascription of mysticism to them, is almost invariably drawn without alteration from non-Christian sources, and with very little indication that any difference was felt between the spirit of the last stages of the pagan and that of the Christian theology. This criticism is of course quite compatible with full recognition of the genuinely Christian character of their personal religion, and of the great service rendered to the Church of England in the Restoration period by the example given in the characters of men like Whichcote and John Smith of the union of philosophical breadth of view and high culture with unworldly earnestness in the spiritual life.

It was said above that not only great philosophers but great poets might enter into the mystic phase of feeling, and give it expression, without themselves being adequately described as mystics. This branch of the subject is especially well treated by Mr. Inge. No part of his lectures surpasses in interest the discussion of the mystical elements in Wordsworth, which constitutes perhaps his most original contribution to the study of mysticism. The mysticism of Tennyson, on which he only touches, may be further illustrated. Mr. Inge does not mention what is (as read in the light of the poet's own comment given in his *Life* ii p. 90) probably the most genuinely mystical passage in Tennyson's writings—the lines in which he makes King Arthur, at the end of the *Holy Grail*, give utterance to a profound conviction of the reality of God, based upon what may fairly be called an ecstatic experience. There is, by the way, a curiously close parallel to the famous lyric, 'Flower in the crannied wall,' in these words of Behmen, *Three Principles* ch. viii (I quote from the translation of 1648, p. 59), 'If he be born of God, he may know in every spile of grass his Creator in whom he liveth.' In the fuller and very admirable account of Wordsworth's mysticism, given by Mr. Inge, the quotations on p. 311 may also be supplemented by reference to a story, which (as I have heard) the late Professor Bonamy Price was wont to tell, of how he asked Wordsworth the meaning of 'fallings from us, vanishings—', in the *Ode on the Intima-*

tions of Immortality, and how Wordsworth replied by catching at a gate which was near, and saying he had sometimes to do this to assure himself of the substantiality of the material things about him, so strongly did the sense of their unreality come upon him. This is closely parallel with the experience of Tennyson mentioned above. And when Wordsworth tells us in the *Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey*—Mr. Inge quotes the passage—how in some of these ecstatic states 'We see into the life of things,' again we are reminded how when Behmen (I quote from the English translation of Martensen's *Jacob Böhme*, p. 7) was 'sitting one day in his room, his eye fell upon a burnished pewter dish, which reflected the sunshine with such marvellous splendour that he fell into an inward ecstasy, and it seemed to him as if he could now look into the principles and deepest foundations of things. He believed that it was only a fancy, and in order to banish it from his mind he went out upon the green. But here he remarked that he gazed into the very heart of things, the very herbs and grass, and that actual nature harmonized with what he had inwardly seen.' The ecstatic state in Tennyson, according to a passage in his *Life* (i. p. 320; quoted by Mr. Inge, p. 15), was sometimes induced by the device of repeating over his own name; just as Behmen's, in the instance quoted, was at first excited by the very ancient method, accidental in his case, of gazing at a brightly polished surface.

Mr. Inge observes (p. 313), 'It has been said of Wordsworth, as it has been said of other mystics, that he averts his eyes "from half of human fate." Religious writers have explained that the neglected half is that which lies beneath the shadow of the Cross. The existence of positive evil in the world, as a great fact, and the consequent need of redemption, is, in the opinion of many, too little recognized by Wordsworth, and by Mysticism in general.' Mr. Inge combats this view, and truly observes that 'in practice, at any rate, the great mystics have not taken lightly the struggle with the law of sin in our members, or tried to "heal slightly" the wounds of the soul.' But he perhaps scarcely sufficiently emphasizes the fact that for many what draws them to the mystics is precisely their full appreciation of the darkest moods of the soul, the independence of their serenity upon that cheerfulness the sources of which are youth and health, which pass away, or upon the power, which some do not possess, of leaving unprobed their convictions on fundamental questions. It is significant that the great philosopher of modern times to whom the name of mystic may be most properly applied—to whom the great mystics seemed not only to have borne witness to a truth, but to have seized more truly than others the secret of existence—is the pessimist Schopenhauer. The great mystics have plucked a religion out of the heart of spiritual darkness and emptiness. This is the secret of their power, whether we think of those who will have no symbols, or of those who delight in them (subjective or objective mystics, as Mr. Inge, perhaps not quite happily, distinguishes them). It is impossible, indeed, to defend the exclusive claims of the *via negativa*. Though everything must be called in question—and that it must is the lesson of modern philosophy from Descartes downwards—in order that the foundation of certainty may be laid beyond the reach of question; yet what we have denied and doubted must be explained and affirmed, no longer indeed as taken on trust, but as thought out. The way of doubt, however, must come first; and all must be lost in the Absolute, that it may be found there. So in the religious life, the mystics who would not remain content with symbols renounced, or had taken from them, all that they had, even the God of their first spiritual experiences; and through a spiritual abnegation, a spiritual poverty, a spiritual death, bitterer than those of the body, found all that they had lost, and more than they had lost, in the God to a sense of whom this practical *via negativa* conducted them. So again, if we may criticize, as we may, the statements of Behmen about the dark *centrum naturae* in God, yet Hegel was right in recognizing a profound philosophical insight in them; and the value of Behmen as a religious guide lies also just in his power to communicate to others his own sense of a God, who is not merely over against the world of pain and evil as light over against darkness, but has taken up into Himself that which out of Him is pain and evil, but in Him is an element never independent, yet ever present in His eternal life of victorious blessedness. Emerson, whom Mr. Inge, though sensible of the absence in him of that air of 'having been in hell' which commonly marks the true mystic, calls 'the great American mystic' (p. 320), appears like an amateur and a pretender by the side either of St. John of the Cross or of Behmen. This is not so indeed with Wordsworth, who 'speaks that he has seen,' with the solemnity of a priest indeed, but not with the affectation of a hierophant. It is true, however, of M. Maeterlinck, whom Mr. Inge mentions only as a commentator on Ruysbroek. Emerson is a thinker of richly endowed mind and master of a distinguished style: and M. Maeterlinck has a singular genius for giving expression to elusive feelings which, but for such a work as *La Mort de Tintagiles*, one would have thought it beyond the power of art to seize. But they are not of the true race of the mystics who 'have been in hell': Carlyle, to whom Mr. Inge (p. 320) will scarcely allow the name of mystic, is far more akin to it than either.

It would be foolish to complain that Mr. Inge has passed by some Christian mystics unnoticed: he could not notice all. But it was something of a disappointment to learn nothing from him about the

Franciscan mystics of the thirteenth century; and it would have been interesting to know how far he considers Swedenborg, Emerson's 'representative' mystic, to be entitled to the name. But Mr. Inge has given us so much that he has whetted our appetite for more, and what seems complaint is gratitude in disguise.

There are some lesser points which seem to call for comment. The passages relating to Greek philosophy are unsatisfactory. To call Heraclitus a 'great idealist' (p. 47), implies an interpretation of his philosophy which is, to say the least, open to question. The quotation from him in the passage of Eusebius given by Mr. Inge in a note, rests upon what is very possibly an entire misunderstanding of the meaning of λόγος in the original. (See the notes to Fragment 2 in Professor Bywater's edition, and Professor Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy* p. 133.) No doubt what is more important for Mr. Inge's immediate purpose is, not Heraclitus' original meaning, but the interpretation put upon him at the beginning of the Christian era: but some hint should have been given that they may have differed. To say that 'Plato's doctrine of ideas aimed at establishing the transcendence of the highest idea—that of God' (p. 118), would never prepare one for finding that the 'idea of God' is not, under that name, to be found in Plato at all. From the account of the Aristotelian 'active intellect,' on p. 361, the reader would not know that Aristotle himself says that the νοῦς comes θυράθεν (*De Gen. An.* 736 *a*, 744 *b*), and that this is not a mere comment of Alexander's.

On p. 195 the author of the *Imitation of Christ* is reproached for quoting with approval the 'pitiful epigram of Seneca, "Whenever I have gone among men, I have returned home less of a man."' But Tauler is guilty of just the same fault (in the *Sermon for Christmas Day*, included in Miss Winkworth's selection). Mr. Inge does not sufficiently allow for the degree to which any words of Seneca were regarded as authoritative texts in the Middle Ages. Mr. Inge has, I think, too high an opinion of M. Récéjac's *Sources de la Connaissance mystique*, a work which seems to me both obscure in style—an unusual fault in a French writer—and confused in thought. Mr. Inge notes that it differs from most mystical treatises by appealing to Kant rather than to Hegel (p. 341). Kant—of whom we are told that 'Willmann gave him friendly greeting (and was not repulsed), because he agreed in so many things with the mediaeval Mystics' (Erdmann *Hist. of Philos.* § 302. 6; Eng. tr. ii p. 427)—had certainly his points of contact with mysticism, chiefly in his insistence on the process of redemption and atonement as something which takes place within the individual's consciousness, but they are not to be found where M. Récéjac appears to seek them.

Mr. Inge's remarks on the 'mystical interpretation' of Scripture

(p. 272) are excellent; but the suggestion of a possible defence of it on the ground that 'everything in the world, if we could see things as they are, must be symbolic of the Divine Power which made it and sustains it in being,' that 'if "one eternal purpose runs" through the ages, it must be discernible in small things as well as in great,' reminds one uncomfortably of the Stoic defence of auspices and divination mentioned by Cicero *de Divinatione*. In taking leave of Mr. Inge's lectures, some special recognition is due to the eloquent and impressive passage of general reflection, with which he closes his survey of Christian mysticism; a passage which will long dwell in the memory of those who heard it delivered, and which breathes the true spirit of a liberal and philosophical theology.

In Lent 1899, when Mr. Inge was Bampton Lecturer, Dr. Bigg delivered in Christ Church Cathedral at Oxford a series of addresses which also touch on the subject of Christian mysticism, and which he has since published under the title *Unity in Diversity*. The purpose of these admirable addresses is practical, rather than scientific, and they were no doubt composed with an eye to the so-called 'crisis in the Church,' of which the newspapers were then full. Dr. Bigg uses the word Mystic in a very wide sense; but he tells us plainly what that sense is. He identifies the 'mystic spirit' with the 'spirit that giveth life' in opposition to the 'letter that killeth' (p. 6). In this sense no doubt the *Confessions* of St. Augustine and the *Imitation of Christ* are rightly ranked as eminent representatives of the 'mystic spirit,' though of mysticism, in a more precise sense, they are scarcely examples at all. Dr. Bigg gives to the 'two streams or tendencies of the religious life, flowing from the same source, but not always side by side,' which 'sometimes . . . exist more or less harmonized in the same community, sometimes . . . have sprung violently apart and formed different communities' (p. 24), the names of Mystic and Disciplinary. Roughly speaking, these terms, as he uses them, correspond to what some would call Protestant and Catholic; understood, of course, as referring to tendencies rather than to formulas or organized religious bodies. The difficulty of avoiding associations, from this point of view irrelevant, while using names so familiar, is no doubt a good reason for seeking others. It is curious to contrast Dr. Bigg's nomenclature, which uses 'Mystic' to denote the tendency which produced the Protestant Reformation, and produces—at least in England and America—the perpetual disruption of Protestant bodies into smaller sects, with the exactly opposite usage of Professor Harnack, who sees in the 'mysticism' even of Tauler or the *Theologia Germanica* nothing but 'Catholic piety in general,' and will allow no relation other than that of sharpest opposition between the mystical and evangelical spirits. No doubt this view is full of difficulties; but it seems to make 'Mystic,' to denote what Dr. Bigg intends to denote, inappropriate for the same sort of reason as 'Protestant.' For custom is lord of language; and, except 'through the looking-glass,' one cannot make words mean what one likes.

A few criticisms in detail of Dr. Bigg's book may be worth making. There is something which, in the work of one so sympathetic as Dr. Bigg, strikes one as unexpectedly irreverent in the dismissal, on p. 6, of Jacob Behmen and St. John of the Cross as 'extravagants'; and one hardly recognizes Carlyle in the company of 'the heathen philosophers' and Bishop Butler as a teacher of 'reasonable self-love,' in a sense in which it is contrasted with 'Christian self-denial.' It would be impossible to give a more misleading notion of his drift than this; every page in *Sartor Resartus* cries out against it. Lastly, on p. 9, Dr. Bigg lays it down as a general principle that 'where there is distinction there must be inequality.' He is thinking of socialistic conceptions of the State and of pantheistic conceptions of the world; but the saying in itself is difficult, and would embarrass (for example) an exponent of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.

C. C. J. WEBB.

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT.

(1) Vol. vii of Herzog's *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, third edition edited by Hauck, is weak like former volumes on the Old Testament side. Franz Buhl gives five or six pages to Feasts, GOTTESDIENSTLICHE ZEITEN IM ALTEN TESTAMENT, and seven pages to HEBRÄISCHE SPRACHE. R. Kittel writes an article of seven pages, HEILIGKEIT GOTTES IM AT. I. Haussleiter devotes seven pages to an article revised from Reuss on HASMONÄER. Wolf Baudissin has eight pages on HADAD-RIMMON, and Gustav Dalman three on HADES, concerned chiefly with the Old Testament and Old Testament Apocrypha. Volck writes on HABBAKUK (two pages), and R. Kittel on HAGGAI (a page and a half). Benzinger contributes four archaeological articles, HAAR, HANDEL BEI DEN HEBRÄERN, HANDWERK B. D. H., HAUS B. D. H. How comparatively inadequate the treatment of the Old Testament is may be measured by the two and a half pages devoted to ROBERT HALL, by the four and a half given to E. W. HENGSTENBERG, and by the fifteen spent on the HEILS-ARMEE.

(2) Vol. i of *Encyclopaedia Biblica* contains some noteworthy contributions to Old Testament Literature. Mr. L. W. King has an important article on ASSYRIA, carrying the history down to Tiglath-pileser III, the later kings who had relations with Israel being appropriately dealt with in separate articles. The same author gives also a very useful article on BABYLONIA. CANON of the Old Testament is by Dr. K. Budde, who gives us a sound piece of work. He differs from Dr. Ryle as to the date of the closing of the third Canon. 'There thus remains,' writes Dr. Budde, 'a space of something like two centuries—say from the end of the second century B.C. to about 100 A.D.—within which we are unable to point out any sure indications of the close of the third canon.' Prof. Robertson Smith's CHRONICLES (from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*) has been retouched by Dr. Driver, especially as regards the Chronicler's treatment of his sources and his religious philosophy of history. Prof. Cheyne has written a group of articles illustrating the subject-matter of Genesis, under the heads, ABRAHAM, ADAM AND EVE,

BABEL (Tower of), CHERUB, CREATION, and DELUGE. Perhaps the interpretation of those 'myths' will not carry conviction generally, but Prof. Cheyne is always interesting in writing on these matters. DEUTERONOMY is by Prof. G..F. Moore. DANIEL is by Prof. A. Kamphausen, who explains the bilingual texture of the book by adopting the opinion of Reusch, that 'The author was so familiar with both languages that he could glide from one into the other without noticing it, and could assume for a great proportion of his contemporaries a knowledge of them both.' DRESS, a very interesting and suggestive article, is by Mr. I. Abrahams and Mr. Stanley A. Cook. Another suggestive contribution is Prof. Ridgeway's short article AMBER, in which several important things are said regarding the intercourse which existed between different parts of the ancient world. The articles by the same author—BERYL, CARBUNCLE, and DIAMOND—are also good.

Speaking generally the Old Testament Articles are good and suggestive, but marred now and again by the adoption of weakly supported theories, and still more weakly supported emendations of the Masoretic text. The M.T. of 2 Sam. xiii 32 (supported by the LXX) is both good in itself and better than any alternative yet offered, and the correction of Amos vi 5, by which the reference to David disappears, is not established by the 'independent agreement of J. P. Peters and Winckler,' nor by the failure of the attempt of the LXX to translate (cf. col. 1033, 1034, notes). Prof. Cheyne's article, AMOS, is perhaps the worst offender in the *Encyclopaedia* against soberness in textual and higher criticism. But it would be inexcusable to end with words of disparagement. Subtract the guesses and a noble piece of scholarship is left.

(3) Prof. R. Kittel, the author of the well-known History of Israel, has brought out an edition of I and II Kings for Nowack's *Handkommentar zum A.T.* It is on a larger scale than I. Benzinger's volume in the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar.* It should be very good coming from a scholar of Kittel's antecedents. It is reviewed in the *Expository Times* for March, 1900, by Mr. J. A. Selbie.

(4) A recent and valuable addition to the literature of the Old Testament is Prof. Toy's *Proverbs* in the *International Critical Commentary. Proverbs* is closely related in matter and manner to *Ben Sira*, and is consequently specially interesting at the present time. Prof. Toy discusses in an Introduction such topics as the thought of the book, its relation to books on similar subjects such as Ben Sira, Ecclesiastes, and Job, its origin and date, its text and versions. Little that is satisfactory can be said about the period of the composition of the book, for the *data* are mainly negative.

Dr. Toy gives full consideration to the testimony of the versions, especially the Septuagint which shows in places wide divergence from the Hebrew in this book. There is little opportunity for syntactical discussions or for historical or geographical illustration, but the meaning of words and the integrity of the text receive full attention. It cannot be said that Dr. Toy's emendations of the M.T. are generally satisfactory; on the contrary, many of the changes he proposes are wilful and lack support. Thus in chap. i 11, he reads, 'Let us lay wait *for the perfect*' against M.T., LXX, Pesh., and Vulg. In ver. 21, in order to bring the text into agreement with the parallel passage, ch. viii 2, he gives '[Wisdom] calls out at the head of the *high places*' against M.T. (*hōmīyōth*, 'noisy streets' R.V. marg.), LXX, Pesh., and Vulg., thus losing a picturesque touch for nothing. Again in chap. xxii 17–21, Dr. Toy gives some eight or nine important corrections with very little support from the versions. An interesting use of the word *daʿath* is lost in ver. 17 by the substitution of 'to learn right things' for 'unto my knowledge.' *Daʿath* means here *knowledge* in a subjective sense as the possession of a particular person, from which sense the fully subjective meaning 'opinion, mind,' which is found in Ben Sira (v 10; xl 5 d marg.) and commonly in Rabbinic, is not far removed. Prof. Toy believes in the comparatively late date of Proverbs, and it is a pity that he should do anything to conceal a characteristically late usage of a word.

(5) Dr. Toy's *Critical Edition of the Hebrew text of Ezekiel*, with notes, Leipzig, 1899, is a full and careful piece of work. The notes occupy about two-thirds of the whole book and occasionally contain other than critical matter, e.g. the identification of the 'river Chebar' with the *nār Kabari*, mentioned on a contract tablet from Nippur. Dr. Toy shows full independence in accepting or rejecting emendations put forward by Cornill, but it may be gravely doubted whether most of Dr. Toy's emendations will ultimately be accepted. We may doubt e.g. the correction of Ezek. viii 17 'to my nose' in accordance with *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, and of xviii 6 'hath not eaten *upon the mountains*' into *with the blood* (after the parallel passage, chap. xxxiii 25). Corrections are far too often admitted in the Polychrome Bible to the text which should be allowed to remain for a long period of testing in the margin. Even 'certain' corrections are sadly uncertain, and the most plausible emendation may turn out to be a mere perversion of fact.

(6) Two volumes have been recently added to the *Cambridge Bible*: *Proverbs* edited by the Ven. T. T. Perowne, Archdeacon of Norwich, and *I* and *II Chronicles* edited by W. E. Barnes, D.D.

(7) In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for October, 1899, Mr. G. Margoliouth, of the British Museum, published two fragments of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), viz. xxxi 12–31 and xxxvi 22–xxxvii 26. The two leaves which contain the fragment seem to have belonged originally to

the MS. called 'B' in the Cambridge edition, to which belong the Lewis-Gibson fragment, the Bodleian fragments, and the Cambridge fragments from chap. xxx 11 and onwards. The general character of the text of this new portion is the same as that of the portions previously discovered. It contains *doublettes* such as have aroused suspicion in the other fragments of the non-originality of the Hebrew text. Like the Cambridge portions it exhibits some striking marks of Neo-Hebrew, e.g. the word ותיק (=*εὐθικός*?), the inseparable particle ש, and the word צער 'sorrow, pain.' Some of its clauses are certainly more pointed than the Greek, and seem to preserve the original reading. The following passages are worth comparing. (Chapter and verse are according to the English Version.)

xxxi 14 *b*.

R.V. (1895).	Hebrew.
And thrust not thyself with it (thine hand) into the dish.	And be not united (תיחד Gen. xlix 6) with him (the grudging host) in the dish (*or* basket).

ibid. 22 *c*.

In all thy works be quick (*ἐντρεχής*), and no disease shall come unto thee.	In all thy works be modest ('mannerly,' צנוע), and no mischief (אסון, Gen. xlii 38) shall touch thee.

xxxvii. 6.

Forget not a friend in thy soul, and be not unmindful of him in thy riches.	Forget not a friend in the battle, and forsake him not when thou takest spoil.

(8) Prof. E. König has published through J. C. B. Mohr a pamphlet of 113 pages, called *Die Originalität des Hebräischen Sirachtextes.* Most of the matter has already appeared in an English dress in the *Expository Times* for August, September, October, November, and December, 1899, but the British Museum fragment is now included in the discussion, and the material is increased by about a fourth.

(9) With the appearance of the present number of the *Journal*, a fresh fragment, smaller than the British Museum fragment, but interesting as being derived from a fresh (a third) MS, appears in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, under the editorship of its discoverer, Dr. Schechter. It covers part of the text we have already, so that now for the first time we are able to compare two MSS at the same passage.

(10) Dr. H. Guthe has written a *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* for the series published by J. C. B. Mohr, to which Cornill's *Einleitung* belongs[1].

---

[1] *Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften.*

It is a concise narrative, extending to the age of the Maccabees. A review of it by Dr. John Taylor is found in the *Expository Times* for March, 1900.

(11) The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago issue an American translation of Prof. Cornill's *History of the People of Israel*, written for lay readers. The story is carried down to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, in 70 A.D. It is a readable book devoid of almost all references to authorities for the statements made.

(12) Prof. Cornill's sketches, called *The Prophets of Israel*, come from the same source, and are now in a fourth edition. The lectures are popular. One specimen of the manner of them may be given; of Jonah Cornill writes: 'This apparently trivial book is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written. . . . In this book Israelitic prophecy quits the scene of battle as victor, and as victor in its severest struggle —that against self.'

(13) Prof. Budde publishes in English, through G. P. Putnam's Sons, his American Lectures on *Religious Life and Thought among the Hebrews in Pre-exilic Days*. They correspond to the lectures published by Prof. Cheyne in 1898 on *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile.*

(14) Prof. Wellhausen has brought out a fifth edition of his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (1899).

(15) The *Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* has attained to a third edition. It has 'Nachträge' amounting to sixty-nine pages. Wellhausen defends his view that the book of Kings, as a whole, was redacted *before* the fall of the Southern Kingdom, with much force, while asserting an exilic or (if not *and*) a post-exilic redaction.

(16) The edition of the *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, edited by Prof. Kautzsch, is now completed, a most important work.

(17) A very useful work for students of Old Testament Theology is the small book of 220 pages, written by Mr. L. W. King, entitled *Babylonian Religion* (Kegan, Paul & Co., 1899). Mr. King rightly takes pains to show the moral side of Babylonian belief.

Among recent contributions to Old Testament literature contained in periodicals the following may be mentioned:—

(*a*) THEOLOGISCHE LITERATURZEITUNG.

Jan. 6. Stade, *Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel*; review by R. Kraetzschmar, who agrees in the main with Stade, but condemns his doubts of the tradition regarding the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, and the conquest of the East of Jordan by Moses.

Feb. 3. Meinhold, *Die Jesajaerzählungen* (Is. xxxvi–xxxix); review by G. Beer, who agrees with H. Winckler against Meinhold that Is. xxxvi 1—xxxvii 8 refers to Sennacherib's invasion of 701 B.C., while xxxvii 9–38 refers to a second expedition of the same king 'gegen 681 B.C.' [Sennacherib was murdered in 681.]

T. Tylor, *Ecclesiastes*; review by Volz, who complains that Tylor in his elaborate analysis of contents strains the meaning in endeavouring to establish a chain of thought between the separate parts of the book. Volz protests against Tylor's conservatism towards the text, and prefers himself 'eine gründliche Ueberarbeitung Qoh. durch spätere Hände anzunehmen.' Tylor 'fails to establish any direct dependence of Koheleth on any Greek school of philosophy.'

Feb. 17. Freiherr von Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten*; review by A. Bertholet, who speaks of the work as 'anregend.'

Littmann, *Ueber die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaja*; review by Gressmann. Littmann agrees with Duhm in suggesting circ. 455 B.C. The reviewer wisely cautions us that our knowledge of the post-exilic period is limited; 'Ob [Jes.] 62^{6} auf die Bedrohung der Mauern um 457 gehe, ob 61^{5f} eine Vorbereitung auf das Gesetzbuch Ezra's seien, ob der מפגיע 59^{16} 63^{5} Artaxerxes sei, ist weder zu beweisen noch zu widerlegen.'

(*b*) Theologisches Literaturblatt.

Feb. 2. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*; review by E. König.

(*c*) Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

1900, I. Moulton, *Ueber die Ueberlieferung und den textkritischen Werth des dritten Esrabuches.* A full textual comparison with Ezra iv 1—x 44 (Hebrew) and Neh. vii 73—viii 13 (Hebrew).

B. Jacob, *Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen.* V. *Zur Geschichte des Psalmentextes der Vulgata im* 16. *Jahrhundert.* An interesting sketch of the early printed editions of the Vulgate from Stephen 1528 to the Clementine.

Nöldeke, *Bemerkungen zum Hebräischen Ben Sira.* Important. One sentence should be quoted: 'Uebrigens bemerke ich noch dass die angeblichen Verwechslungen von persischen oder arabischen Wörtern, womit D. S. Margoliouth seine Hypothese stützt, m. E. fast alle so gut wie undenkbar sind.'

Diettrich, *Einige grammatische Beobachtungen z. drei im British Museum befindl. jemenit. Handschriften des Onqelostargums.* An important bit of work. The author has succeeded in finding some *Corrigenda* for Dalman's Grammar of Jewish Aramaic.

Baumann, *Die Verwendbarkeit der Pešhita zum Buche Ijob für die Textkritik.* Contains chaps. xxii–xxxiii.

(*d*) ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT.

Vol. liii III. P. Jensen, *Die Inschrift I von Jerabis*. Gives a suggested transcription and provisional translation of the five lines of this inscription, with a very full philological commentary. Jensen wisely remarks, ‘Zwischen dem Nichts und dem Ganzen liegen die Bruchtheile.’

(*e*) JOURNAL ASIATIQUE.

Tom. xiv 3, Novembre–Décembre, 1899. *Nouvel Essai d’Interprétation de la seconde Inscription Araméenne de Nirab* par M. Paul de Kokowzoff. These Nirab inscriptions, unlike those of Zendchirly found near them, are in pure Aramaic. They are sepulchral, probably of the seventh century.

W. E. B.

P.S. David Nutt issues (1900) a *Hebrew Grammar with Exercises* by Michael Adler B.A., Hebrew Master at the Jews’ Free School, London. The nomenclature employed is old-fashioned (e.g. ‘perfect’ and ‘future’ tenses), and the Ashkenazi pronunciation of *ḳameç* as ō is used, but the book is probably the simplest and most practical introduction to the Hebrew language which exists in English.

W. E. B.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

Church Quarterly Review, January 1900 (Vol. xlix, No. 98: Spottiswoode & Co.). The Testament of our Lord, Part I—The Prayer Book as a Rule of Life—Professor Gardner on the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief—Christian Mysticism—Undercurrents of Church Life in the Eighteenth Century—Dr. Van Dyke on an Age of Doubt and a World of Sin—A Roman Apologist and his Translator—Mediaeval Ceremonial—Robert Grosseteste—The Education Question from a Churchman's point of view—The Loan of Consecrated Churches in India—Recent Pronouncements.

Jewish Quarterly Review, January 1900 (Vol. xii, No. 46: Macmillan & Co.). C. G. MONTEFIORE Nation or Religious Community?—M. STEINSCHNEIDER An Introduction to the Arabic literature of the Jews: I (*continued*)—Miss N. DAVIS Poetry: Ode to Zion—L. BLAU Dr. Ginsburg's Edition of the Hebrew Bible—I. ABRAHAMS Paul of Burgos in London—Mrs. H. LUCAS Poetry: The Jewish Soldier—The Hebrew Text of Ben Sira: S. SCHECHTER The British Museum Fragments, W. BACHER Notes on the Cambridge Fragments—M. BERLIN Notes on Genealogies of the Tribe of Levi in 1 Chron. xxiii–xxvi—C. G. MONTEFIORE The Religious Teaching of Jowett—D. H. MÜLLER Strophic Forms in Isaiah xlvii—T. K. CHEYNE Canticles v 13 and vii 1.

Expositor, January 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 1: Hodder & Stoughton). A. B. DAVIDSON The Uses of the Old Testament for Edification—W. M. RAMSAY Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians—D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (1) The Bible of the Gentiles—J. WATSON Doctrines of Grace: Saving Faith—A. BLACK Joseph, an Ethical and Biblical Study: (1) 'The Youth and his Dreams'—J. A. CROSS Note on Acts ix 19–25.

February 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 2). J. WATSON Doctrines of Grace: The Perseverance of the Saints—W. M. RAMSAY Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians—A. BLACK Joseph, an

Ethical and Biblical Study (2)—A. T. BURBRIDGE The Prayer with reference to Self-made Temptations—C. ANDERSON SCOTT Ministering in Sacrifice—D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (2) The Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon.

March 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 3). J. RENDEL HARRIS On Certain Obscure Names in the New Testament: a Problem in Palaeography—N. J. D. WHITE The First Miracle and the Exaltation of Christ's Human Nature—D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (2) The Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon (*continued*)—B. WHITEFOORD Christ and Human Emotions —W. M. RAMSAY Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians—A. BLACK Joseph, an Ethical and Biblical Study: (3) The Blank in the Tent—G. W. STEWART Jülicher on the Nature and Purpose of the Parables.

(2) AMERICAN.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, January 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 41: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). W. P. DICKSON Dr. McGiffert's Historical Methods—H. OSGOOD The Unerring Witness to the Scriptures—W. B. GREENE Academic Preparation for the Seminary—B. B. WARFIELD 'God-Inspired Scripture'—B. C. STEINER Some Unpublished Letters of Dr. Schaff—W. H. ROBERTS The Washington Council of the Reformed Alliance—H. C. MINTON Mr. Fisk's 'Through Nature to God'—S. T. LOWRIE Dr. Bruce on the Epistle to the Hebrews—W. S. P. BRYAN Dr. Adger's 'Life and Times'—Recent Theological Literature.

The American Journal of Theology, October 1899 (Vol. iii, No. 4: Chicago, University Press). J. M. COULTER The proper use of Science by the Pulpit—W. RUPP Ethical Postulates in Theology—J. F. HURST The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England—J. H. ROPES Resch's Logia: C. C. TORREY Resch's Logia—Document. F. C. CONYBEARE A hitherto unpublished treatise against the Italian Manicheans—Critical and Historical Notes. F. P. BADHAM The Martyrdom of St. John—G. A. BARTON The Bearing of the Composition of the Psalter on the Date of the Forty-fourth Psalm—Recent Theological Literature.

January 1900 (Vol. iv, No. 1). C. A. BRIGGS The New Testament Doctrine of the Church—J. MACPHERSON Was there a second Imprisonment of Paul in Rome?—C. R. HENDERSON A half century after Thomas Chalmers—J. A. BEWER The history of the New Testament Canon in the Syrian Church—The Hastings Bible Dictionary, Vol. II—Critical and Historical Notes: W. D. MCLAREN Prof. Salmond and Conditional Immortality; A Criticism—Recent Theological Literature.

(3) FRENCH.

Revue Biblique, January 1900 (Vol. ix, No. 1: Paris, V. Lecoffre; for the school of the Dominican convent of St. Stephen of Jerusalem). TH. CALMES Étude sur le prologue du quatrième évangile—CONDAMIN Études sur l'Ecclésiaste—TOUZARD Nouveaux fragments hébreux de l'Ecclésiastique—LAGRANGE L'itinéraire des Israélites du pays de Gessen aux bords du Jourdain—Mélanges: LEVESQUE Notes sur quelques mots hébreux—GERMER DURAND Épigraphie palestinienne—MICHON Notes sur une inscription de Baʿalbek et sur des tuiles de la Légion X Fretensis—Chronique: Hypogée judéo-grec découvert au Scopus—Excursion en Philistie; les fouilles anglaises—VINCENT Nouvelles de Jérusalem—SÉJOURNÉ Mosaïque de Hosn—Recensions—Bulletin.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1899 (Vol. iv, No. 4: Paris, A. Picard). DOM BESSE Les règles monastiques orientales antérieures au concile de Chalcédoine—J.-B. CHABOT Les évêques jacobites du viiie au xiiie siècle (*suite*)—S. VAILLÉ Répertoire alphabétique des monastères de Palestine—F. NAU Opuscules Maronites: Histoire de Sévère patriarche d'Antioche (*suite*)—H. LAMMENS Voyage au pays des Nosairis—V. ERMONI L'ordinal copte (*suite*)—E. BLOCHET Neuf chapitres du *Songe du viel pelerin* de Philippe de Mézières relatifs à l'Orient—DOM RENAUDIN Mélanges: Bénoit XIV et l'église copte—Bibliographie.

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses, January–February 1900 (Vol. v, No. 1: Paris, 74 Boulevard Saint-Germain). H. COCHIN L'Age de Dante—H. MARGIVAL Richard Simon et la critique biblique au xviie siècle: Introduction—L. DUCHESNE Sur l'origine de la liturgie gallicane—Chronique d'histoire et de philosophie médiévale: M. DE WULF (1) Origines de l'étude historique de la philosophie médiévale; (2) Ce qu'il faudrait faire; (3) Ce qui a été fait; (4) Conclusion, La synthèse—Ancienne philologie chrétienne 1896–1899: P. LEJAY (3) Premier et deuxième siècle; (4) Apocryphes; (5) Clément d'Alexandrie; (6) Hippolyte; (7) Origène—Chronique biblique: J. SIMON (3) Exégèse de l'Ancien Testament (*suite*); (4) Exégèse du Nouveau Testament; (5) Histoire biblique; (6) Religion d'Israël et théologie biblique.

(4) GERMAN.

Theologische Quartalschrift, 1900 (Vol. lxxxii, No. 1: Ravensburg, H. Kitz). SCHOLZ Zu den Logia Jesu—BELSER Zur Chronologie der evangelischen Geschichte—HOCH Zur Heimat des Johannes Cassianus—SAEGMULLER Die *Visitatio liminum ss. apostolorum*—SEPP Die Moschee Davids und Kapelle der *Dormitio*—Reviews—Analecta.

(Vol. lxxxii, No. 2.) FUNK Das Testament unseres Herrn—

DOELLER Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ps. xxii—PETERS Zur Strophik des Ekklesiastikus—KUENSTLE Die Schriften des Britischen Bischofs Fastidius—KOCH Zur Lehre von den sog. Pönalgesetzen—Reviews—Analecta: Zur Dionysius-Frage.

Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, January 1900 (Vol. xliii, No. 1: Leipzig, O. R. Reisland). A. HILGENFELD Der gnostische und der kanonische Johannes über das Leben Jesu—E. F. SCHULZE Elemente einer Theodicee bei Tertullian—J. DRAESEKE Nikolaos von Methone im Urteile der Friedensschrift des Johannes Bekkos—Reviews.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, January 1900 (Vol. x, No. 1: Tübingen, &c., J. C. B. Mohr). SCHUERER Das Wesen der christlichen Offenbarung nach dem Neuen Testament—SCHULTZ Das Bekenntniss in der evangelischen Kirche.

February 1900 (Vol. x, No. 2). RADE Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Sinnes im Protestantismus: Antrittsvorlesung gehalten am 13. Januar in Marburg—STUCKERT Das Sündenbekenntnis—DREWS Der Rückgang der Kommunikanten in Sachsen: eine geschichtliche Studie über kirchliche Sitte.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1900, No. 2 (Gotha: F. A. Perthes). BOHN Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen—EBELING Der erste Glaubensartikel in Luthers kleinem Katechismus—KOEHLER Der Charakter des Johannes Falk und die Bedeutung seines Wirkens für die Geschichte der 'Innern Mission'—ELSENHANS Beiträge zur Lehre vom Gewissen—Notes: KNAAKE Bemerkungen zum Briefwechsel der Reformatoren—SCHWARTZKOPFF Einige Bemerkungen zur wahrhaft geschichtlichen Methode in der Erforschung des Lebensbildes Christi—Reviews: LANG Doumergue's Jean Calvin—ERNST Wolf's Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, January 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 1: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). BURGER Zum neuen Jahre—R. SEEBERG An der Schwelle des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts—ED. KÖNIG Der Streit um den neulich entdeckten hebräischen Sirachtext—VON SCHWARTZ Die Bedingungen der Taufe auf dem Missionsfelde.

February 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 2). R. SEEBERG An der Schwelle des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts (*Schluss*)—G. KAWERAU Geburtstag und Geburtsjahr Luthers—H. SCHNELL Ein Zeugnis des Rostocker Theologen David Chyträus über den Abendmahlstreit.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JULY, 1900

ST. PAUL'S EQUIVALENT FOR THE 'KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.'

THERE is a broad contrast between the Gospels and the Epistles which strikes the eye at once: the one simple, pellucid, profound with the profundity that comes from elemental ideas and relations and that is quite consistent with great apparent artlessness of expression; the other involved and laboured, only at times emerging into real simplicity of language, often highly technical, and if profound, not seldom also obscure.

This contrast, as I have said, strikes the eye from the first. It represents not only two styles of writing but two distinct types of thought.

From the point of view of criticism the distinction of these two types is important. There is no better guarantee of the generally authentic character of the Gospel record. The older Tübingen criticism spoke of Pauline and Petrine elements in the Gospels. And the very first thing we should expect would be that some such elements would enter into them. But the wonder is that the extent to which they are actually present should be so small. When the Gospels are examined the really intrusive Pauline and Petrine elements (in the Tübingen sense) are found to be quite insignificant. The distinctness of type is hardly affected. There is exceedingly little running of the one type into the other. All this we may take as proof that the teaching of our Lord as it is recorded in the Gospels has been preserved substantially as it was given. We have by the side of it later types of teaching of marked individuality. These later types in one form or another covered nearly the whole Christian world. And yet they have not encroached upon the earlier. They have not obliterated its sharpness of outline. There is practically no confusion of type. The teaching of the Gospels has not been corrupted by the theology of the Epistles. The teaching of the Epistles has not been mixed up with that of the Gospels. The two types stand out clearly marked off from each other[1].

But this state of things leaves us with a problem which has been, I cannot but think, as yet insufficiently faced. What is the relation of the two types to each other? The one, as we can see, passed into the other; but how did it pass? Can we trace a continuity between the leading conceptions of each? How far is there a real identity of substance underlying the difference of form?

A wide field of investigation is opened up which I believe needs more working out than it has received either in England or on the Continent. This we may hope will not be wanting.

For the present I propose to take only one leading conception of the Gospels, but that perhaps the most central of all—the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, or of Heaven. I propose to ask, What becomes of this conception in the Epistles, and in particular in the earlier Epistles of St. Paul? I propose to ask, first, if we find this conception there; and if we do not, or so far as we do not, what takes its place.

Now it is remarkable upon the face of it that we hear so little of the Kingdom of God in the Epistles. Let us think for a moment of the way in which it is the one theme of a whole succession of our Lord's parables; and then of the very subordinate place, to say the least, which the conception takes with St. Paul. If we run over in mind the main trains of thought in all his Epistles, and especially in the early Epistles, it is conspicuously absent.

And yet the conception by no means disappears entirely. It occupies really just the sort of place that we might expect, if it were taken over from an earlier body of teaching—a body of teaching of which the Apostle himself had not been a hearer, but which came to him rather at secondhand and when his own mental habits had been largely formed.

---

[1] On this subject see especially an essay by von Soden in the volume dedicated to Weizsäcker (Freiburg i. B., 1892), p. 113 ff.

There are a few familiar places where the phrase occurs. Five times over the Apostle speaks of 'inheriting the Kingdom of God.' Four times he reminds his readers that evil-doers will not inherit the Kingdom (1 Cor. vi 9, 10; Gal. v 21; Eph. v 5); once he says that flesh and blood cannot inherit it (1 Cor. xv 50). In all these places he has in view the Messianic Kingdom of the saints in glory. And it is in the same sense that he encourages the Thessalonians with the hope of being 'counted worthy of the Kingdom of God,' for which they were suffering (2 Thess. i 5). This is the purified and spiritualized Christian form of the current Messianic expectation.

There are however two passages which go beyond this. One is in Romans (xiv 17), where it is said that 'the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.' And the other is in 1 Corinthians (iv 20), where the Kingdom of God is described as not being 'in word but in power.'

In both these cases the Apostle is thinking not of anything future but of the present, not of any catastrophic change, but of the actual experience of Christian men. Where were they to look for the coming of the Kingdom? What were to be the signs of its coming? The signs are—not any change in the Levitical order, a new list of clean and unclean, new regulations as to abstinence or the like, but a new spirit permeating the life, a new attitude and temper of mind, a new relation of the soul to God—righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. What a beautiful description in those few strokes! What an advanced experience of the best gifts of religion! How undreamt of by Pharisee or Sadducee or Essene or Zealot! There was only one school where the Apostle could have learnt that lesson—the school of Jesus. If we had only that one verse it would suffice to tell us that the teaching of Jesus had really sunk into his soul.

And it is no less a direct reflexion of that teaching when he says that the Kingdom of God is 'not in word but in power.'

I shall have in a moment to say more of this aspect of the Kingdom.

We may think it strange that with so much insight into the mind of the Master, St. Paul did not fall more into His habitual language. He did fall into it; he did adopt it, in no lukewarm manner, but with heart and soul. And yet it is only on rare occasions that this particular mode of speech comes uppermost.

To change a whole vocabulary is not an easy thing. St. Paul had been brought up as a Pharisee. He was like one of us, trained in his own academic tradition. The language of that tradition was the mould into which his thoughts naturally fell.

Further, he was an ardent student of the Jewish Bible. The words of Psalmists and of Prophets lived in his memory. And they happened to be a different cycle of words from those which are most prominent in the Gospels.

It is marvellous to see how St. Paul has recast the old phrases and reads into them a specifically Christian content. But the phrases are old; they are in great part phrases to which he had been accustomed before he became a Christian.

Let us once again then ask where the coincidence between the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles comes in. I said just now that St. Paul really knew what Jesus had meant when He spoke of the 'Kingdom of God.' He knew His innermost, distinctive, and characteristic meaning. Many times our Lord seems to speak—or half to speak—as His contemporaries might have spoken. The Kingdom of God was the Messianic Kingdom. But He infused into the phrase a larger as well as a deeper meaning than it bore on the lips of the people. The Messianic Kingdom was for Him the culmination, or bringing to a head, of a process that was always going on. It is probable that the phrase which we translate 'Kingdom of God' meant quite as much, as it is said to mean predominantly in the Talmud, 'reign' or 'sovereignty' of God[1]. It was nothing less than the sum of all those influences and forces that specially betoken the presence or manifestation of God in the world.

The world is energized by God. There are constantly streaming, as it were, down from heaven a number of currents which come straight from God. The Apostle's phrase expresses exactly the effects by which these divine currents are manifested. Where they are, there are ‘righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.’

---

[1] Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes* ii 454 n, ed. 2 (539 n, ed. 3).

But the Apostle knew quite well that these were the effects and not the cause. The cause lay in those mighty powers or energies put forth by God for the redemption of the world. To be within the range of those powers, to clasp them—so to speak—to the heart, was to ‘enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.’ It was to be really loyal to God as King—to let His sovereignty have its way, not to obstruct and oppose but to welcome it, to surrender the will to it, to open the soul to those divine influences and forces which flowed in its train.

This is the Kingdom which Jesus told His listeners was ‘within them[1].’ Those influences and forces taken into the heart were the pearl of great price, the treasure hid in the field. Righteousness and peace were their natural fruit. And the consciousness of them brought with it an exceeding great joy.

Such is the life-history of this work of God within the soul. It begins above in the highest heaven; it ends below in the hearts of men. It diffuses itself throughout the world. It passes from one soul to another. It is like a river rising among the hills and increasing in volume as it flows. It sweeps individuals along with it, so that they gather into a society. And so another kind of figure becomes applicable to it. It is like a draw-net cast into the sea and bringing the fish which it encloses to land.

Where shall we seek an analogy for all this in the writings of St. Paul? The thought of the Kingdom is so central in the teaching of Jesus that we naturally look for its counterpart in the central teaching of the Apostle. Now by common consent that central teaching is contained in two verses of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: ‘I am not ashamed of the Gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed the righteousness of God by faith unto faith’ (Rom. i 16, 17: RV. has ‘*a* righteousness,’ but ‘*the* righteousness’ is probably better).

---

[1] For proof that this is the true sense of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν see especially Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1899), p. 71.

We may put aside the mention of 'faith.' It is no doubt a term of great importance for the purpose of St. Paul; it is less important for ours. St. Paul has in view the psychological process by which the righteousness of God becomes actual for the believer. With this we are not concerned for the present, though if it were to be examined we should find the teaching of the Apostle on this head fall perfectly into its place.

For us the important term is 'the righteousness of God.' This expression, I think we may say, is better understood now than it was only a few years ago. At that time there seemed to be an almost established tradition in Protestant exegesis that was not so much wrong as one-sided and inadequate.

I cannot think that it was wrong to explain the words in Romans on the analogy of the more explicit language of the Epistle to the Philippians. St. Paul there in a well-known passage (Phil. iii 8, 9) speaks of his hope that he may gain Christ and be found in Him, not having a righteousness of his own, 'even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith' (τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει). The insertion of the preposition ἐκ makes the phrase explicit. The contrast of the two kinds of righteousness is decisive. On the one hand is the righteousness which he disclaims, the righteousness which he calls 'his own,' the righteousness of Scribes and Pharisees, the product of a mechanical obedience to law. On the other hand is the righteousness which he desires, the righteousness which is 'from God based on faith.' This righteousness, however much it begins with God, must at least end as a state or condition of man. It is as such that the Apostle prays that it may be his.

And yet it does begin 'from God'; and it is this beginning that has had less justice done to it. When St. Paul says, in the verse of Romans, that in the Gospel is revealed 'the righteousness of God,' he means in the first instance the Divine attribute of righteousness, just as in the verse that follows he says that the wrath of God is also revealed. For him the whole Gospel is summed up as a revelation of the righteousness of God.

It is a very large conception, and one that is not easy to grasp at all adequately.

This is an instance that illustrates in a striking way how much we are at the mercy of language. We remember that the Latin- and Romance-speaking peoples have but a single word for 'justice' and for 'righteousness.' The almost inevitable consequence is to lose sight of the larger meaning in the smaller.

We are somewhat better off than that. We have the two words, and we can keep clear the two senses. We are not in so much danger of limiting our idea of righteousness to that of equal dealing between man and man. But even we must find it hard to rise to the full height of the conception as it was present to the mind of St. Paul.

St. Paul had behind him the whole weight of the Old Testament realized with a vividness and a force with which it is impossible for us to realize it.

Now there is perhaps hardly any word in the Old Testament that has so rich and full a meaning as this word 'righteousness,' especially as applied to God.

Even as applied to man, even as applied to the Judge, it is still a good deal more than 'justice.' The righteousness even of the Judge is before all things tender care for the weak, the defence of those who cannot defend themselves—the poor, the fatherless, the widow, the stranger—vigilant protection of the oppressed. Hence it goes on to mean an ever-present and ever-active sympathy. We see this in the famous passage in the Book of Job (xxix 14–16), 'I put on righteousness, and it clothed me: my justice was as a robe and a diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the needy: and the cause of him that I knew not I searched out.'

When this character is transferred to God it is of necessity enlarged and deepened yet further. We must never forget that for Israel everything was seen in the light of the special relation in which God stood to His own people. All that is tenderest, all that is most gracious, was concentrated upon this relation. And the word for it all—the word that describes the faithfulness of God to His covenant with His people—was 'righteousness.' That one comprehensive word described the deepest workings of the Divine Mind as it went forth in lovingkindness and pity to the people of His choice. All the mighty acts of the Lord sprang from this motive and from this relation: 'In His love and in His pity He redeemed them; and He bare them, and carried them all the days of old' (Isa. lxiii 9).

All this we may be sure that Paul the Pharisee grasped intensely. In so doing he was not exceptional. The sense of the love of God for Israel, of the covenant relation between Jehovah and His people, was the very best side of Jewish religion. The Jew too often traded upon his privileges, too often let himself repose on them without making any strenuous effort really to live up to them. But that was the perversion of a feeling good in itself. The sense of intimacy between Israel and its God, the delighted response of the nation to its Benefactor, is one of the brightest strains in the Old Testament, and is not confined to the Old Testament, but runs on into the Talmud, and is deeply implanted in the consciousness of the Jewish race.

Even Paul the Pharisee felt all this. But what of Paul the Christian? For him it was not lost, but transformed and indefinitely strengthened. We must remember that all the Jew felt for Israel as a nation St. Paul took over bodily, and claimed for the Church of Christ. The covenant relation of God and His people still subsisted, but with a nearness and with a sense of reality that could not attach to it before. The mighty acts of the Lord which the Christian recalled and on which he placed his hope and his confidence were not far back in the distant past, but they centred in the life and death and resurrection of One whom the generation then living had seen and known, to whose words they had listened, and whom their hands might have handled. And further, the influence which we associate with the gift of His Spirit was one of which they had actual experience day by day.

Can we not understand the extraordinary vividness with which it all came home to the mind of the Apostle, and which he tried in his turn to convey to the outer world? His whole life was one prolonged effort to convey to the world outside what Christ had done for them that loved Him.

It was but natural that St. Paul should throw his description of this into the forms supplied to him by the Old Testament. The Old Testament was saturated with the conception of the righteousness of God. The history of Israel was the expression of the working of that righteousness. And it lay very near at hand to regard the whole great Divine process which constituted Christianity as an expression of the same righteousness. It was the righteousness of God which set it in motion. Through the operation of that righteousness it became the power of God unto salvation to every one that believed, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. The righteousness of God showed itself in the desire to produce in man a righteousness which should be the reflexion of itself. Justification and sanctification are the technical names for the process. We should try to think of them not as technicalities but as the actual living effects that men like St. Paul felt in themselves and saw in the hearts and lives of the brethren around them.

And now let us compare this sketch of what the Apostle meant by the righteousness of God with the teaching of the Gospels about the Kingdom of God or of Heaven.

The righteousness of God, as we have seen, was not a passive righteousness, but an active energizing righteousness. It was simply God at work in the world. And the Kingdom of God also, if we try to express it in unmetaphorical language, was just the same thing—it too was *God at work in the world.*

St. Paul's phrase, borrowed straight from the Old Testament, lays stress upon the moral character of the process, which had its root in the moral character of God from whom it sprang. His essential righteousness was the moving cause and the active persistent force at work behind and through the whole.

The 'Kingdom' or 'reign of God' is slightly more neutral in form. It does not lay the same stress upon the moral nature of the Kingdom or reign. But this is implied, and implied close at hand, even if it is not expressed. It is enough to say that it is the Kingdom, or reign, *of God.* God asserting His sovereignty in the world must needs assert it in the form of righteousness. If we say that it is His love which impelled Him, we have also seen that righteousness, as it was conceived in the Old Testament and as St. Paul conceived it, included a large element of love. And in like manner the Kingdom, realized among men, necessarily expressed itself in righteousness. 'The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.'

The points of contact are evident. God may put forth His sovereignty either on the large scale or on the small. He may make it seen by broad movements in the world, by the founding and growth and spread of His Church, or by the working of His gracious influence in the hearts of individual believers. Parables like the Leaven or the Mustard-seed cover both at once. For the Divine seed may be as a germ in the heart, and the Divine leaven may work in the heart as well as in a society making its conquests in the larger world.

Then so far as that society reflects its origin it must do so by its righteousness, and as an instrument for the propagation of righteousness; while for the individual, righteousness is the wedding-garment in which all the guests of the Kingdom must be attired.

And in both cases, the fruit of the Kingdom as of the energizing righteousness of God is peace and joy. 'The Kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in the field; which a man found, and hid; and in his joy he goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field' (Matt. xiii 44). Compare this with the description of the effects of righteousness by faith in the Epistle to the Romans: 'Being therefore justified—or put into this condition of righteousness, the righteousness which comes from God—by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand; and let us rejoice—or exult—in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but let us also rejoice—or exult—in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, probation; and probation, hope: and hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us' (Rom. v 1–5). There we have a detailed description of the 'joy of the kingdom.'

The parallelism thus runs through all the stages. The greatest emphasis in both cases is on the point of origin. The energizing righteousness is the righteousness of God; the Kingdom is the Kingdom *of God* or of heaven; that means that it is God's sovereign power, the influences and forces that come from Him, at work among men. Both express themselves as righteousness; both make their presence felt in a settled temper of exultant joy.

The language is different. That of the Gospels turns on a phrase that runs all through the Old Testament, beginning with the Books of Samuel and ending in the Book of Daniel, to be kept alive in the popular Messianic expectation. The language of St. Paul is based perhaps mainly on that of the Psalms and the second part of Isaiah. But the content of the two cycles of language and of thought is substantially the same; or it only throws into relief slightly different aspects of that which has a fundamental identity. The central and cardinal point of the Christian dispensation is the same, whether we call it the 'righteousness of God' or the 'Kingdom of heaven.' In either case it is the goodness and love of God, actively intervening to guide, redeem, sustain, and bless His people.

W. SANDAY.

THE ANCIENT INDIAN CONCEPTION OF THE SOUL AND ITS FUTURE STATE.

I PROPOSE in this paper to deal with the beliefs of the ancient Indians regarding the soul and its future state as presented by Indian literature during a period of some fifteen centuries down to about 200 A. D. This period embraces the whole of Vedic and the early centuries of Sanskrit, or as it is often called classical Sanskrit, literature. I draw the line at 200 A. D., because by about that date the religious and philosophical ideas of the Indians had attained their full development; since then they have undergone no modifications of primary historical interest.

The literature of this period is specially important for the history of religion and philosophy for various reasons. It is, in the first place, distinguished by its originality. Naturally isolated by its gigantic mountain barrier on the north, the Indian peninsula, ever since the Aryan invasion, formed a world apart, and had by the fourth century B. C., when the Greeks invaded the north-west, fully worked out a national culture of its own unaffected by foreign influences. Secondly, the oldest Vedic writings present to us an earlier stage in the evolution of religious beliefs than any other literary monument of the world. Thirdly, Sanskrit literature registers a continuity of life and thought which is unique among the Aryan nations. The civilisation of all the European peoples was entirely transformed ages ago by the adoption of Christianity, and that of the Persians by the adoption of Muhammadanism. Modern India, on the other hand, can trace back its language and literature, its religious rites and beliefs, its philosophical ideas, its domestic and social customs, through an uninterrupted development of more than 3,000 years. Finally, the main content of Vedic literature is religious and philosophical; it is, moreover, very extensive, being more than equal to what survives of the literature of ancient Greece. Hence the sources at our disposal for the present inquiry are in a high degree original, early, continuous, and complete.

Among the sources supplied by ancient Indian literature, within the period I have indicated, six different strata may be distinguished. The earliest is that of the four Vedas; but of these only two are of importance for our purpose. The older of these two, the Rig-veda, which is a collection of metrical sacrificial hymns more than a thousand in number, contains several funeral and theosophical hymns. It is the earliest literary monument of India, for its most recent portions cannot be later than 1000 B. C.; it is at the same time our most important source for the evolution of religion in India. It represents the advanced religious ideas of the priestly class. The Atharva-veda, which assumed shape some centuries later, on the other hand, exhibits the lower beliefs current among the masses. Its chief content is witchcraft connected with domestic and social usages. At the same time it includes more theosophical hymns than the Rig-veda itself. For the history of civilisation it is on the whole more interesting and important even than the older Veda.

A second stage is represented by the Brāhmaṇas, prose theological treatises dealing for the most part with explanations of the sacrificial ritual. Dating from between 800 and 600 B. C., they supply comparatively little information about the subject with which we are now concerned.

Much more important in this respect are the theosophical treatises called Upanishads, for their main theme is the nature of soul. The oldest of them, written in prose, are pre-Buddhistic, as their main doctrines are presupposed by Buddhism; that is to say, they must have been composed by 600 B. C.

The fourth stratum of our authorities consists of the compendia called Gṛihya Sūtras. They deal with domestic and social usages, of which funeral rites form an important part. As they supply a complete picture of the life of the ancient Indian from birth to the grave, they are highly important anthropologically. They were composed in the period between 500 and 200 B. C.

A fifth stage is represented by the various systems of Indian philosophy which assumed definite shape in the two centuries preceding and the two following the commencement of our era. They are largely concerned with the nature of soul.

Lastly, we have the first of the great Law-books, the Mānava Dharma Çāstra, or Code of Manu, which was composed about 200 A. D. It contains both philosophical sections and an enumeration of various hells.

The moral Sūtras or compendia of Buddhism, written in Pāli, the eldest daughter of Sanskrit, some centuries before our era, belong to much the same period as the Gṛihya Sūtras; but the data they furnish, at least with regard to the soul, are purely negative[1].

Turning to these sources themselves, we can now summarise historically the information they supply regarding the ancient Indian conception of the soul. In the Rig-veda 'soul' is synonymous with the animating principle; and nearly all the names by which it is here denoted show that it was regarded as more or less identical with breath. One of these names is *prāṇa*, 'respiration,' another *asu*, 'spirit,' and the third *ātman*, 'breath.' This expression *ātman*, which later becomes the regular term for 'soul' or 'self,' still means nothing more in the Rig-veda than 'breath,' for it is often used as the express parallel of *vāta*, 'wind.' There is also a fourth term which is sometimes employed in a secondary sense to express 'soul.' This is *manas* (from *man*, 'to think,' and etymologically identical with the Greek μένος), the ordinary meaning of which is 'mind' as the seat of the mental operations. In some passages, however, where it is contrasted with 'body,' it clearly has the sense of 'soul.'

There are many passages, occurring mostly in the Atharva-veda, which show that life was held to be dependent on the continuance of 'soul' (*asu* or *manas*), and that death resulted from its permanent departure. Soul was further considered to be capable of separation from the body during unconsciousness. Thus in a whole hymn of the Rig-veda (x 58) the soul (*manas*) of one who is lying apparently dead is besought to return from the distance where it is wandering. The soul was regarded vaguely as dwelling somewhere inside the body. There is, however, at least one passage in the Rig-veda (viii 95, 5) which locates it. Here the *manas* is described as speaking 'in the heart' (*hṛidi*). But there is nothing in the Vedas to show what beliefs were held as to how the soul entered into or escaped from the body.

---

[1] Further information about these literary periods will be found in the present writer's *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Heinemann, 1900).

It is further clear from the Rig-veda that the soul was regarded as capable of continued existence after death. Thus the term *asunīti* or *asunīta*, 'spirit-leading,' is frequently used to describe the conduct by Agni, god of fire, of the souls of the dead on the path between this and the other world. There is no clear statement as to what was thought to be the nature or condition of the soul during this passage. It was, in any case, always believed to retain its personal identity; for the funeral texts never invoke the *asu* or *manas* of the deceased, but only the individual himself as 'father,' 'grandfather,' or other relative, as the case may be. But there can be no doubt whatever that, after the arrival of the soul in the next world, its continued existence was believed to be a corporeal one[1].

It should here be noted that the rite of cremation materially influenced the ancient Indian conception of the state of the soul after death. Though burial is a few times referred to in the Rig-veda, cremation was undoubtedly, even in the earliest Vedic period, the usual method of disposing of the dead. The later ritual of the Gṛihya Sūtras knew only this method, their rules allowing only children under two years of age and ascetics to be buried; and this custom, as is well known, still prevails among the Hindus of the present day.

The dead man was provided with ornaments and clothing for use in the next life. Traces even survive in the Rig-veda which show that his weapons and his wife were once burnt with the body of the dead husband; for his bow is removed from his hand, and his widow lies down beside the corpse before it is burnt on the pyre, though she is summoned to return to the world of the living, and to take the hand of her new husband, doubtless a brother of the deceased[2].

---

[1] The Vedic beliefs regarding the soul are more fully treated in the present writer's *Vedic Mythology* (Strassburg, 1897), § 72, where numerous references are given.

[2] There is hardly any mention of the cruel practice of widow-burning in the whole range of Vedic literature; but in Sanskrit works of the seventh century A.D.,

During the process of cremation Agni is in the Rig-veda besought to preserve the corpse intact and to burn the goat which is immolated at the same time; the god is also invoked to heal any injury that bird, beast, ant, or serpent may have inflicted on it.

An indication of the importance of the corpse in connexion with the future life is the fact that the loss of the dead man's bones, which, according to the Gṛihya Sūtras, were collected after cremation and buried, is stated in one of the Brāhmaṇas[1] to be a severe punishment.

After cremation the disembodied spirit is regarded as being conducted by Agni with the column of smoke to the sky. The Rig-veda gives us hardly any details of the passage to the other world, simply stating that the dead go by the path trodden by the fathers, along the heights by the way first found out by Yama, chief of the dead. It tells us, however, that on this road they have to pass the two broad-nosed, brindled, brown dogs of Yama that guard the path[2]. The Rig-veda distinguishes the path of the fathers (*pitṛi-yāṇa*) from the path of the gods (*deva-yāna*), doubtless because the funeral-fire is different from the fire of sacrifice.

The Atharva-veda gives a more detailed account of the journey to the other world. Here we are told that, invested with lustre like that of the gods, the spirit proceeds in a car or on wings; that it is wafted onward by the Maruts (or storm-gods), fanned by soft breezes and cooled by showers[3].

---

it appears as a matter of course that the wife of a king should mount his funeral pyre. Later the custom became universal, and continued to be so till 1829, when it was abolished by the British government. It is highly probable that this practice was in India, as in other countries, originally limited to the families of kings, and only found a place in the official law of the Brahmans after it had gradually spread to other classes. Then the Brahmans, with that aptitude for absorbing all manner of outside elements into their system, themselves made an attempt to justify the practice by falsifying a passage of a funeral hymn of the Rig-veda by substituting the word *agneḥ*, 'of fire,' for *agre*, 'at first.' It is certain that the priests of the time of the Rig-veda did not recognise the practice; and that it is absolutely wrong to describe the custom of *satī* (literally 'virtuous woman') as an invention of the Brahmans.

[1] Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI vi 3, 11; XIV vi 9, 28.

[2] In the Avesta a four-eyed yellow-eared dog keeps watch at the head of the Cinvat bridge, which is supposed to lead from this world to the next, and with his barking scares away the fiend from the souls of the holy ones, lest he should drag them to hell.

[3] See *Vedic Mythology*, p. 166.

On arriving in the other world the spirit is united with its old body, which has been refined by the power of Agni, and is now free from all imperfections and frailties. Here the deceased man sees father, mother, and unites with wife and children. Such statements show that the personal identity of the deceased was thought to be fully preserved in the next life.

The abode which the dead obtain is described as situated in the midst of the sky, in the inmost recess of the sky, where is eternal light, in the third heaven, in the highest heaven, in the highest step of Vishnu, in the highest point of the sun [1].

Here they meet with the fathers or ancestors, who revel with Yama; here they enjoy bliss with the gods, under a tree with abundant foliage. Here the sound of the flute and of songs is heard. Here Soma, ghee, and honey flow; here are ponds filled with ghee, and streams flowing with milk, honey, and wine. Here are bright many-coloured cows which yield all desires. Here prevail gladness, the fulfilment of all wishes, and abundant sensual joys. Here are neither rich nor poor, neither powerful nor oppressed. Here the dead are united with what they have sacrificed and given [2]. This heavenly abode is the reward of those who practise penance, of heroes who risk their lives in battle, but especially of those who bestow abundant gifts on priests. In short, heaven to the composers of the Vedas was a glorified world of material joys as pictured by the imagination, not of warriors, but of priests.

Those who have recently entered this heavenly abode are spoken of as pious men who enjoy bliss with the gods; while the term *pitaraḥ*, or fathers, is applied rather to earlier ancestors. These ancestors are worshipped. Two hymns of the Rig-veda are specially dedicated to their praise, and the food offered to them is distinguished from that offered to the gods. In the Atharva-veda they are stated to be immortal, and many of the powers which distinguish the gods are attributed to them in both Vedas. There is, however, no evidence to show whether the immortality of the fathers was thought to be absolute, any more than that of the gods.

This future life of bliss in heaven is the reward of the righteous only. But what is the fate of the souls of the wicked? Very little information on this point is to be found in the Rig-veda. A 'deep place' is said to have been produced for those who are evil, false, and untrue. The gods Indra and Soma are besought to dash the evil-doers into the abyss, into bottomless darkness, so that not even one of them may get out; and a poet prays that the demoness who malignantly wanders about may fall into the endless abysses, and that the enemy and robber may lie below all the three earths. The evidence of all the references to this subject in the Rig-veda[1] does not go beyond showing belief in a hell as an underground darkness. Such a belief, indeed, in all probability goes back to the period when the Iranians and Indians were still one people; for the Avesta also is acquainted with a dark abode as a place of punishment for the wicked.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* § 73, p. 167.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 168.

The conception of hell is already more definite in the Atharva-veda, which speaks of it as the house below, the abode of female goblins and sorceresses, and gives it the specific name of *nāraka-loka*, the infernal world, as contrasted with *svarga-loka*, the celestial world, the realm of Yama. From this time onwards *Naraka* is the regular name of hell in Sanskrit literature. This hell is several times in the Atharva-veda described as 'lowest darkness,' 'black darkness,' and 'blind darkness.' In one hymn (V 19) of this Veda some reference is even made to the torments of hell. Thus one of its verses states that 'they who spat upon a Brahman, who desired tribute from him, sit in the middle of a pool of blood, chewing hair.' There is also a passage in the Yajur-veda in which murderers are described as being consigned to hell.

The view of the Vedas, then, is briefly this. The soul is regarded as the animating principle, sometimes with the added faculties of emotion and thought, and is located in the heart. It is capable of separation from the body, but does not long remain in this condition of separation. After death it is united with a glorified double of the terrestrial body in the height of heaven, where it enjoys a life of unending bliss as a reward of virtue. With regard to the souls of the wicked after death, the belief of the earliest Veda was very indefinite, not going beyond the idea of confinement in a dark underground abode; but this belief became somewhat more developed in the later Vedas.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* § 75, p. 169, 170.

Coming to our second literary period, we find that the theory about the soul is still much the same as in the Vedic stage which has just been described, but shows certain developments with regard to the future life, thus forming a transition to the views held in the next stage. Among these developments it may be noted that the Brāhmaṇas begin to distinguish between the world of the gods (*svarga-loka*) and the world of the fathers (*pitṛi-loka*); that here the reward of performing sacrifice correctly comes to be described as union or identity of nature with Prajāpati or Brahmā, the chief of the gods; and that the torments of hell have become more definite; men, for instance, being described as having their limbs hewn off one by one, or as being devoured by others as an exact requital for deeds done during life on earth. But what is much more important than all this, the doctrine now for the first time begins to be stated that after death, all, both good and bad, are born again in the next world, and are recompensed according to their deeds. Thus the *Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, or 'Brāhmaṇa of the hundred paths,' states that every one is born again after death, and is weighed in a balance, receiving reward or punishment according as his works are good or bad. The same Brāhmaṇa states that as a reward for knowing a certain mystery a man is born again in this world. Here we have the beginnings of the doctrine of transmigration dependent on retribution, which is fully developed in the next period, that of the Upanishads.

This momentous doctrine entirely changed the complexion of Indian thought, and has prevailed in India ever since. The aim of life to the Indian was no longer, as in the age of the Vedas, the attainment of earthly happiness and afterwards bliss in the abode of Yama, by sacrificing correctly to the gods; its aim was now release from the chain of mundane existences by the absorption of the individual soul in the world-soul through correct knowledge. It is noteworthy that this release or salvation (called *moksha* by the Brahmans and *nirvāṇa* by the Buddhists), which became the object of all the religious and philosophical systems of India from about 600 B.C., is always dependent on some form of knowledge, *not* on faith. In the Upanishads we have, in fact, a new religion, virtually opposed to the ritual or practical religion which had hitherto prevailed, for knowledge is now everything and ceremonial practice nothing. In place of the optimistic polytheism of the Vedas, we have now in the Upanishads a pessimistic pantheism. The chief god of the Brāhmaṇas, Prajāpati, the Creator, has become *brahma*, the embodiment of holiness, which is now regarded as the soul (*ātman*) of the universe. The material universe, being only a manifestation of it, is an illusion (*māyā*), for Brahma is the only reality. Here is a description of the world-soul from the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, a work which cannot have been written later than about 600 B. C.

'It is not large, and not minute; not short, not long; without blood, without fat; without shadow, without darkness; without wind, without ether; not adhesive, not tangible; without smell, without taste; without eyes, ears, voice, or mind; without heat, breath, or mouth; without personal or family name; unaging, undying, without fear, immortal, dustless, not uncovered or covered; with nothing before, nothing behind, nothing within. It consumes no one, and is consumed by no one. It is the unseen seer, the unheard hearer, the unthought thinker, the unknown knower. There is no other seer, no other hearer, no other thinker, no other knower. That is the Eternal in which space is woven and which is interwoven in it.' Here, for the first time in the history of human thought, we find the absolute grasped and proclaimed.

The fundamental doctrine of the Upanishads is the identity of the individual soul with this universal soul; it is summed up in the celebrated formula *tat tvam asi*, 'that art thou.' Salvation here is obtained by correct knowledge of this identity.

Hand in hand with this doctrine goes that of transmigration. The theory of the Brāhmaṇas does not go beyond the notion of repeated births and deaths in the next world. It is transformed to the doctrine of transmigration in the Upanishads by supposing rebirth to take place in this world. According to this theory every individual passes after death into a series of new existences in heavens and hells, or in the bodies of men, animals, and plants on earth, where it is rewarded or punished in strict accordance with its *karma* or action committed in a former life. This doctrine was already so firmly established in the sixth century B. C., that Buddha received it without question into his religious system; and it is the universal belief of the Hindus at the present day. There is perhaps nothing more remarkable in the history of the human mind than that a strange doctrine like this, never philosophically demonstrated, should have been regarded as self-evident for 2,500 years by every philosophical school or religious sect in India excepting only the materialists.

As the doctrine of transmigration is entirely absent from the Vedas and the early Brāhmaṇas, it seems probable that the Indian Aryans borrowed the idea in a rudimentary form from the aborigines; but they certainly deserve the credit of having elaborated out of this rudimentary idea the theory of an unbroken chain of existences intimately connected with the moral principle of requital. The immovable hold it acquired on Indian thought is doubtless due to the satisfactory explanation it offered of the misfortune or prosperity which is often clearly caused by no action done in this life. Indeed, the Indian doctrine of transmigration, fantastic though it may appear to us, has the twofold merit of satisfying the requirement of justice in the moral government of the world, and at the same time of inculcating a valuable ethical principle which makes every man the architect of his own fate. For as every bad deed done in this existence must be expiated, so every good deed will be rewarded in the next life.

We may now summarise the statements of the Upanishads respecting the soul while in the body and after death. In the living body in its ordinary state the soul dwells in the interior of the heart. In the older Upanishads the soul is described as being in size like a grain of barley or of rice, in the later ones, as of the size of a thumb. It is in shape like a man, being also called the dwarf. Thus it is a kind of inner mannikin, a psychical Tom Thumb. Its appearance is also compared with various objects, such as a flame, a white lotus, a flash of lightning, a light without smoke. It is described as consisting of consciousness, mind, the vital airs, eye and ear, the elements, desire, and anger. In other passages the soul is said to be made of mind only, or of consciousness only, but even then it is said to rise out of the elements[1].

---

[1] Cp. Rhys Davids, 'The Theory of "Soul" in the Upanishads,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1899, pp. 71–87.

In dream sleep the soul is, in the Upanishads, held to be away from the body. 'Therefore they say: Let no one wake a man brusquely; for that is a matter difficult to be cured for him, if the soul find not its way back to him[1].' During the dream, the soul, leaving the body in charge of the vital airs, wanders at its will, builds up a world according to its fancy, till at last, tired out, it returns, like a falcon which, after roaming about in the sky, flaps its wings and is wafted to its nest.

During dreamless deep sleep the soul is said to pervade the whole body, to the very hairs and nails, by means of the 72,000 arteries.

There is no distinct statement in the Upanishads as to the time or manner of the entrance of the soul into the body, the views held on this point being hazy. But there are passages which show that the soul was supposed to have existed before birth in some other body, and to have been inserted at the origin of things into its first body downwards through the suture in the top of the skull into the heart; or, as one passage has it, through the tips of the feet upwards through the belly into the head. There is also a curious speculation on the transfer of the soul at the time of generation.

As to the manner of the soul's exit after death, the statements are just as vague and contradictory as those about its entrance.

The statements as to the way in which the soul transmigrates are also somewhat conflicting. The most important and detailed account is that given in the two oldest Upanishads. Here we are told that the forest ascetic possessed of correct spiritual knowledge, after death enters 'the path of the gods' (*devayāna*), which leads to absorption in Brahma. The householder, on the other hand, who has performed sacrifice and good works, goes by the 'path of the fathers' (*pitṛiyāṇa*) to the moon, where he remains till the consequences of his actions are exhausted. He then returns to earth, being first born again as a plant, and afterwards as a man of one of the three highest castes. Here we have a double retribution, first in the next world, then by transmigration in this. The former is due to a survival of the old Vedic belief about the future life. The wicked are described as born again as outcasts, or birds, beasts, and reptiles[2].

---

[1] Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, IV iii 14.

[2] Cp. the present writer's *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 224–5.

The Gṛihya sūtras, our fourth literary stratum, are largely concerned with funeral rites. From them we learn what were the popular beliefs regarding the condition of the soul during the period immediately following death. The soul is here represented as remaining separated from the Manes for a whole year as a *preta* or ghost. After the lapse of that period the *preta* was admitted to the circle of the fathers by a special funeral rite. A monument was then erected, the bones being taken out of the urn and buried. The Gṛihya sūtras describe various offerings to the Fathers or Manes, taking place at fixed periods, such as that on the day of new moon. These rites of ancestor-worship still play an important part in India, well-to-do families in Bengal spending not less than 5,000 to 6,000 rupees on their first *Çrāddha*[1].

We now come to the fifth stage, the philosophical systems. The two most important are the Vedānta and the Sāṅkhya. The Vedānta is nothing else than the doctrines of the Upanishads methodically arranged. In this system individual souls are regarded as not really existent, being identical with Brahma, which is the only existent entity. Just as much as all other phenomena of the material world, they are an illusion, the ultimate cause of which is *avidyā*, a species of innate ignorance. The theory of the transmigration of the soul is here more elaborate than in the Upanishads. The soul may rise by gradations of merit from plants and insects through gods up to Brahma, when it obtains salvation by recognising that it is identical with Brahma. The cycle of transmigration is held to have had no beginning and is not brought to an end by the cataclysm at the end of a cosmic age; but starts again on the renewal of the world. Thus there is a never-ending series of cosmic as well as individual cycles of transmigration.

The dualistic Sāṅkhya philosophy denies the existence of a supreme soul altogether. It only acknowledges matter on the one hand and an infinite number of individual souls on the other. These souls possess no attributes or qualities and can only be described negatively. There being no qualitative difference between souls, the principle of personality and identity is here supplied by the subtle or internal body, which, formed chiefly of the inner organs and the senses, surrounds and is made conscious by the soul. This internal body accompanies the soul on its wanderings from one body to another, whether the latter be that of a god, a man, an animal, or a tree. When salvation is obtained the internal body is dissolved into its material elements, and the soul, becoming finally isolated, continues to exist individually, but in absolute unconsciousness. Saving knowledge here consists in recognising the absolute difference between soul and matter. It is interesting to note that according to the doctrine of the Sāṅkhya, all mental operations, such as perception, thinking, willing, are not performed by the soul, but are merely mechanical processes of the internal organs, i. e. of matter.

---

[1] Cp. *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 257.

The heterodox system of Buddhism was in all probability based on the oldest form of the Sāṅkhya doctrine. Like the Sāṅkhya it denied the existence of a supreme soul, substituting a void (*çūnya*) for the world-soul, destitute of all attributes, of the Upanishads. Strange to say Buddhism acknowledged the lower ephemeral gods of Brahmanism, holding them, like the other systems, to be subject to the law of transmigration, and, unless they obtained saving knowledge, to be on a lower level than the man who had obtained such knowledge. Buddhism went further than the Sāṅkhya in denying the existence not only of the world-soul, but of the individual soul also. At the same time Buddha accepted the theory of transmigration, for which the existence of the individual soul seems a necessary postulate. For what was there to migrate from one body to another, if there were no soul? Buddha got over the difficulty by his doctrine of *Karma*, which he makes the connecting link between a former and a subsequent birth. According to this doctrine, as soon as a sentient being (man, animal, or god) dies, a new being is produced according to the *Karma*, the desert or merit, of the being who had died.

Salvation, according to the logical view in Buddhism, can only mean annihilation. But Buddha himself refused to decide the question whether *nirvāṇa* is complete extinction or an unending state of unconscious bliss. The latter view was doubtless a concession to the Vedāntic conception of Brahma, in which the individual soul is merged on attaining salvation.

In connexion with Buddhism it may be mentioned that, according to its cosmogony, the abodes of living beings are divided into thirty-one worlds. The lowest of these are the hells or places of punishment (*naraka*). In the old system of the Northern Buddhists there are eight hot hells and eight cold ones, all having special names. In the later northern works and in the Pāli canon of the Southern Buddhists there are still more hells.

The heretical school of the Chārvākas went one step further than even the Buddhists. They denied not only the existence of a supreme soul and of the individual soul, but also the doctrine of transmigration which was accepted by every other school in India. To them matter was the only reality. Soul they regarded as nothing but the body with the attribute of intelligence. They hold that it comes into being when the body is formed by the combination of the elements, just as the power of intoxication arises from the mixture of certain ingredients. They were very severe on the religion of the Brahmans. The Vedas, they said, were only the incoherent rhapsodies of knaves and were tainted with the three faults of falsehood, self-contradiction, and tautology; Vedic teachers were impostors, whose doctrines were mutually destructive; and the ritual of the Brahmans was useful only as a means of livelihood. If, they ask, an animal sacrificed reaches heaven, why does the sacrificer not rather offer his own father? 'While life remains,' they say, 'let a man live happily, let him feed on ghee, even though he run into debt; when once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again[1]?'

The views set forth in the earliest of the Law-books, the Code of Manu, on the subject of the soul, are mainly based on the doctrines of the leading philosophical systems. The many stages the soul passes through in transmigration are here described in great detail; and the torments of hell occupy a position of some importance as deterring from crime. No fewer than twenty-one terrible hells are enumerated as in store for evil-doers. The torments of some of them furnish curious analogies to the notions prevailing in the European Middle Ages. Only one of Manu's hells need be mentioned here as an instance, the *Asi-pattra-vana*, the forest of trees with sword-leaves.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 407.

Looking back over the ground we have covered, we can hardly fail to be struck by the rapidity with which the Indian mind developed the ideas on the subject of soul with which it started.

To begin with, we have the chaotic polytheism of the Rig-veda. Then in the Brāhmaṇas we have a chief god, Prajāpati. By about 600 B. C. we have already substituted for this creator[1] a supreme soul without any attributes. Brahma, the highest possible abstraction. By 500 B. C. the existence even of this absolute being is denied by the founder of Buddhism.

Secondly, with regard to the human soul, the Indian mind travelled, within the same period, from the primitive views of the Rig-veda to the Sāṅkhya conception of *individual* souls without attributes. The existence even of these was denied by Buddha.

Thirdly, from the material Rig-vedic conception of the life hereafter being one of physical pleasure in heaven, we come, within the same time, to the highly abstract view of the Upanishads, according to which the soul loses its individual existence by being merged in the supreme soul which is destitute of qualities. Buddha goes a step further, and assumes complete extinction.

Fourthly, from the simple vague Rig-vedic conception of hell as an underground darkness, we arrive by the end of the second century of our era at the elaborate system of sixteen or more hells in Buddhism and the twenty-one Brahmanic hells of Manu.

Lastly, from the simple Rig-vedic idea of a permanent abode in heaven as a reward, and in darkness as a punishment, we reach, by 600 B.C., the complicated system of requital and salvation as worked out in the theory of transmigration, which has dominated Indian thought ever since.

It has, of course, only been possible here to treat the subject quite cursorily, for a whole volume would be required to deal with it in an adequate manner. But enough has perhaps been said to show that a study of the ancient Indian conception of the soul during life and after death occupies a highly important place in the history of religious evolution.

A. A. MACDONELL.

---

[1] Though Prajāpati remains in the subordinate position of a Demiurge.

[2] On Indian hells compare Leon Feer, 'L'enfer indien,' in *Journal Asiatique*, 1893 and 1895.

THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST.

[The following article was published originally in 1886 in the *Christian Academy*, the organ of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, in which the writer, Dr. S. Sollertinsky, is Professor. Dr. Sollertinsky desired to evoke discussion on the subject among Western scholars, and in order to make his paper accessible to them, it now appears in the JOURNAL, translated into English by Professor Orloff of King's College, London. Some references to modern authorities have been added by the Rev. W. C. Allen of Exeter College, Oxford: these are enclosed in square brackets. Ed. J.T.S.]

I

THAT St. John the Baptist was beheaded by order of Herod Antipas is beyond question; but upon the circumstances which led up to this event, there is a considerable divergence in our authorities. In the Gospel narrative Herodias is represented as the immediate cause of the Baptist's death. But the Jewish historian, Josephus, makes Herod alone responsible, and makes no mention of the supper, or the dancer, or the suggestion made to her by Herodias. These accounts are not only divergent, but directly contradictory.

How this discrepancy has been used in the interests of negative rationalistic criticism can be easily understood by those who have some idea of its general tendency. It is not less important to notice that harmonistic writers in their attempts to bring into agreement the data found in the original documents are far from attaining the success which their labours deserve.

Bleek[1] insists upon the possibility of reconciliation, without, however, explaining how it is to be brought about. Hausrath[2], in a vivid narration of the event, was able to combine the sources by drawing the first part of his picture in accordance with the spirit of the account of Josephus, and by availing himself, for the second half, of the fullness of lifelike details mentioned or implied in the Gospels. But every one can see that there appear in his narrative (unlike the original sources) two equally responsible factors, whilst in the Gospels Herod is merely the tool of Herodias, and in Josephus Herodias has nothing whatever to do with the crime. Olshausen[1] takes for the point of harmony Matt. xiv 5, 'Herod feared John.' But in doing so he represents Josephus as having made what was really the cause of St. John's imprisonment, the cause of his execution: and he is compelled to weaken down the clear meaning of Marc. vi 20, and to represent the relations between Herod and St. John as much more distant than they are described by the Evangelist. Fritzsche[2] maintains that the description of Josephus refers to the imprisonment of the Baptist. But this only emphasises the contradiction between Josephus and the Gospels, since Matt. xiv 3 clearly states that the Baptist was put into prison for Herodias' sake. Keim and Edersheim had the good fortune to point out in print for the first time those passages which should be taken for decisive in the solution of the problem: but even these writers are no more successful than other harmonists. For Keim[3] has sacrificed the lifelike narrative of St. Mark, a course due, perhaps, to his opposition to the view that this Gospel is prior to the other two; while Edersheim[4] ignores Josephus altogether, and, like Keim, fails to notice the explanation of the event which is suggested by the Gospel passages for the first time noticed by these writers themselves.

---

[1] Bleek, *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien*, Leipz. 1862, ii 6.

[2] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, i 330. 334. 338 f., Heidelberg, 1868.

Endeavours to reconcile the Evangelists and Josephus have thus proved unsatisfactory; and with good reason. Indeed it is remarkable that scholars who deal elsewhere drastically enough with Josephus, should not have questioned the credibility of his account of the event under discussion. Ewald[5] indeed does contrast it unfavourably with that of the Gospels, but without giving grounds. And yet there is much to awaken suspicion. In the first place it is a well-known fact that Josephus does not free himself from personal sympathies; and there are cases where he is influenced by these to such an extent that he alters statements which he has made in an earlier part of his narrative[1]. And when we come to the consideration of events in which the person of Antipas is concerned, we are bound to consider the historian's statements with the greatest care. He regards Antipas as the rival of Agrippa; and all his sympathies were with the latter, whose conduct he always represents in the most favourable light possible[2]. Even when Antipas was driven into exile, undoubtedly through the intrigues of Agrippa[3], Josephus represents the former as punished by God on account of the latter[4]. In view of this, his discrepancies with the Gospel narratives respecting the execution of St. John must be put down to personal hatred of the unfortunate tetrarch: and this even though his account is contrary to what we should expect. For it might have been supposed that he would represent Antipas more unfavourably than do the Gospels: and yet it appears as though he were trying to save his reputation as much as possible. This has been long ago noticed and placed to the credit of the historian. The Gospels, it is said, explain everything by the personal hatred of Antipas for St. John; Josephus ascribes the execution of the latter to political reasons. But why did not the critic ask the question: how far is such an attitude of the historian towards Antipas consistent with his general relation with regard to him, and does he not really maintain toward him in this case the same attitude as he adopts elsewhere? Further inquiry fully justifies this supposition.

---

[1] *Biblischer Commentar*, 3. Aufl., Königsberg, 1837, i 472 f.

[2] See Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1837, i 416.

[3] *Jesu von Nazara*, Zürich, 1871, ii 511–4.

[4] *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*[2], i 671–5.

[5] *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, v 194, Anm. 3. [On the credibility of Josephus see Schürer, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes*, i 364, Anm. 24. The English translation, published by Clark, i 11. 25, here misrepresents the original. Schürer holds that the text of Josephus is here open to suspicion. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iii 278, has no doubt that it has been interpolated. Zahn, *Einl.* ii 418, thinks that Josephus has borrowed from Christian sources.]

---

[1] Such e. g. is the statement of the way in which Antigonus (whose humiliation Josephus never fails to mention) mutilated Hyrcanus, *B. J.* i 13. 9. Cf. *Ant.* xiv 13. 10.

[2] e. g. on the death of Gaius, Agrippa advised Claudius to assume the imperial power. To the Senate he expressed his readiness to lay down his life in carrying their wishes into effect, and yet immediately afterwards informed Claudius of the disorder in the Senate, and recommended him to oppose their wishes. This inconsistent conduct the historian approves. *Ant.* xix 4. 1.

[3] *Ant.* xviii 7. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i 415.

According to Josephus[1] Herod noticed that St. John's preaching attracted great multitudes of people. He was afraid that these might rise in revolt against him, and with a view to checking any such possible insurrection he cast St. John into prison, and there put him to death. Now Herod's fear cannot have been produced by the mere concourse of people, such as had at former periods not infrequently gathered to hear the preaching of prophets. And that it cannot have been the subject-matter of St. John's preaching which suggested the idea of a revolt in Herod's mind, Josephus' own account of it sufficiently shows[2]. 'This righteous man (ἀγαθός) was calling the people to virtue and to inward purity symbolized by baptism'—a hellenized account of that same preaching of repentance and of the approach of the kingdom of God which is described in the Gospels. But what sedition could Herod fear from preaching which turned the attention of men entirely to inward improvement? Politically the effect of such preaching would be rather to prevent than to quicken sedition. Volkmar[3] indeed suggests that John taught the immediate appearance of the Messiah, and that the people, interpreting this in accordance with their tradition as involving freedom from Gentile supremacy, might have been expected to rise against the Roman authority. But this explanation is not warranted by Josephus, according to whom St. John did not announce the immediate appearance of the Messiah, and Herod had other reasons for fearing the result of the Baptist's preaching. And even supposing that Herod knew that St. John's preaching contained an announcement of the Messiah, it is unlikely that he would have put the Baptist to death on this ground. A little later Herod knew that Christ was gathering round Him still greater multitudes, yet he did not imprison Him, but rather greatly desired to see Him (Luc. ix 9). It follows therefore that if political considerations did not provoke Herod to put to death the greater one, still less could they have urged him to this course in the case of the lesser. Again, if Herod knew that the Baptist was summoning the people to meet the Messiah, he must also have been aware that he called them to come not with arms in their hands, but with purified desires of the heart and righteous conduct. No doubt we might suppose that Herod had no correct information as to the Baptist's preaching, and imagined that it was more dangerous than was really the case. But at least, after St. John's arrest, examination must have made it clear that he had set politics aside in his preaching, being indeed in this respect the greatest of the Old Testament prophets. And, in fact, Hausrath[1] and Edersheim[2] have rightly seen that Herod was accurately informed with regard to St. John's preaching, in accord with what the Gospels tell us of conversations between the two.

---

[1] *Καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἥσθησαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δείσας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐῴκεσαν συμβουλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου πράξοντες, πολὺ κρεῖττον ἡγεῖται πρίν τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι προλαβὼν ἀνελεῖν τοῦ μεταβολῆς γενομένης [μὴ] εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεσὼν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψίᾳ τῇ Ἡρώδου δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθεὶς . . . ταύτῃ κτίννυται. Ant.* xviii 5. 2 [ed. Niese].

[2] *Κτείνει γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσιν καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένοις βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι· οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι μὴ ἐπί τινων ἁμαρτάδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκεκαθαρμένης. Ibid.*

[3] *Die Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1870, p. 355.

Lastly, it might be urged in defence of Josephus' account, that although Herod was well aware of the unpolitical character of St. John's preaching, his suspicious character made him give way to fear. It is of course difficult to lay much stress upon the incompatibility in ordinary cases of credulity, which Herod had shown in a striking degree, with suspiciousness, of which no evidence has remained. But anyhow, the case of the Essenes who were permitted to live in accordance with their statutes, who therefore were recognized as politically harmless, and with whom in Herod's conception St. John must have been identified, would have satisfied the tetrarch that the preaching of moral improvement ignores political considerations. And if there remained any trace of suspicion in Herod's mind, it must have disappeared when he was brought into personal contact with the Baptist.

Thus when the narrative of Josephus is interpreted in the light of our other knowledge, the incompatibility of the cause given (the preaching of St. John) with the effect (the Baptist's execution) is undisguised. We must therefore suppose some intentional or unintentional omission on the part of the historian. In filling up the lacuna harmonistic writers[1] suppose that in Herod's opinion the Baptist's preaching was likely to foster revolt, not in view of its fundamental contents, but for secondary reasons. In addressing the people St. John may have rebuked the tetrarch for his unlawful marriage with the wife of a brother still living who had a daughter by her. Such an accusation would be dangerous to Herod, and may have provoked him to still further crime.

---

[1] i 330.

[2] i 656 f.

Now it cannot be said that this explanation is an interpolation into the narrative of Josephus. The historian, by giving an account of Herod's marriage[2] immediately before his description of St. John's preaching, does make it possible for the reader to suppose that this unlawful act was the effective cause in Herod's fear of a popular rising. And Josephus certainly had reasons for not wishing to be explicit about the marriage. Had he been so, he would have been obliged to throw an unfavourable light on Herodias, who had Hebrew blood in her veins, and (like Agrippa alone among the tetrarchs) belonged to the Asmonean family[3], with which the historian boasts that he himself was connected on his mother's side[4]. Moreover it was impossible for him to describe, as do the Gospels, how the great-granddaughter of the Chief Priest, and future wife of the tetrarch who was most favourable to the Jews[5], engaged in dancing, an occupation ignominious even for the basest Jew. When he explains the execution of St. John as due to political considerations he cares for the honour of Herodias, not of Antipas. To save her reputation he represents Herod, 'who feared revolt,' as the sole cause of the Baptist's condemnation to death.

It is of course of no great consequence to us whether Josephus is logical in his treatment of Antipas or not. What is important is the fact that his discrepancy with the Gospel narrative over the circumstances of the execution of St. John is to be explained on the ground of his personal sympathies. In sending the

---

[1] Hausrath, i 334 f.

[2] *Ant.* xviii 5. 1.

[3] She was the granddaughter of Mariamne, who was the granddaughter of Hyrcanus and wife of Herod [Jos. *B. J.* i 12. 3].

[4] Jos., *Vita*, § 1.

[5] viz. Philip, *Ant.* xviii 5. 4.

Baptist to death from fear of revolt Herod would not only have acted in a manner inconsistent with the indecision of character which Josephus ascribes to him, but would have displayed an incredible want of that foresight with which he is credited by the same historian. Let us suppose that Herod had not made himself master of the general tenor of the Baptist's teaching, that he ignored the facts that the people had of late abstained from interference with the private family affairs of the Herodians, and that in Herodias, a member of the Asmonean family, he possessed a strong safeguard. Still he must have known that the probability of revolt would be increased more by the prophet's death than by his denunciations. That Herod was aware of this is testified by St. Matthew, who narrates that under the influence of a personal irritation at the denunciations of the Baptist, Herod wished to put him to death, but refrained from fear of the people (Matt. xiv 5).

It is not without ground, therefore, that we conclude that the responsibility for the substantial differences between the Gospels and Josephus with respect to the death of St. John must be assigned to the latter.

With regard to particular details in the narrative of the Gospels, these have been investigated with such care that sufficient data seem to have accumulated for a final solution. Thus long ago it was said that according to St. Mark the first husband of Herodias is called Philip, and that according to Josephus Herod the Great had among his sons only one Philip, the tetrarch, who in his old age married Salome, the daughter of Herodias [1]; so that Philip would have married his own daughter. But against this it has been rightly noticed that just as Herod Antipater may have had, and according to Josephus did have, two sons named Antipas or Antipater, so he may have had two sons named Philip; of whom one (whom Josephus calls Herod) would be the first husband of Herodias, the other the husband of Salome [2]. In any case, by the first husband of Herodias St. Mark undoubtedly meant the same person as the Herod of Josephus, whom his father disinherited: witness the fact that he calls him 'Philip' without the title, which he would certainly have added had he meant the tetrarch.

---

[1] *Ant.* xviii 5. 4.

[2] Olsh., i 472; Eders., i 672, n. 2.

For Philip the tetrarch was universally popular, and the Evangelist could hardly have called the worse tetrarch, Antipas, 'king,' and have left the better without a title at all. The reason of his speaking of the first husband of Herodias as Philip and not Herod, as Josephus calls him, is probably to be found in the fact that he had already used the name Herod for Antipas[1].

Again it is pointed out that according to St. Matthew Herod was afraid of the people, whereas, according to St. Mark he was afraid of the Baptist himself[2]. But the fact is that the two passages refer to two different occasions. St. Mark defines the general relations to explain why Herodias, notwithstanding all her power over her husband, could not prevail upon him to put St. John to death. St. Matthew points out what it was which had kept Herod from giving way to the anger produced in his mind at the denunciations of St. John.

Further, from Bruno Bauer to the present day the opinion has been expressed that the execution of the Baptist took place before the criminal marriage of Antipas. This singular and self-confident supposition is founded on the statement of Josephus, that St. John was confined at Machaerus. Josephus tells us that the wife of Antipas, when she heard of his unlawful betrothal to Herodias, obtained his permission to go to Machaerus which belonged to her father (τότε πατρὶ αὐτῆς ὑποτελῆ[3]) and that from this fortress she escaped to her father. Josephus does not say that Antipas afterwards obtained in war the fortress of Machaerus, and of course it is incredible that he should have received it as a gift. Therefore, as Antipas cannot have imprisoned St. John in a fortress belonging to his enemy, the imprisonment took place before the period when Machaerus came into the possession of Aretas, i. e. before his wife asked permission to go there[4]. But Ewald[5] reading ὑποτελῆ for ὑποτελές has shown that the word refers not to Machaerus but to the officer who met the daughter of Aretas there. Indeed Volkmar might have asked himself why the daughter of Aretas should request Herod's permission to go to Machaerus, instead of to her father, if the fortress belonged to him: or how, in asking permission, she could conceal her intention of going to her father. The whole proceeding only becomes intelligible if it is the idea of an honourable retreat which Josephus means to ascribe to her.

---

[1] [Cf. Schürer, i 362, Anm. 1, who holds that the 'Philip' of Marc. vi 17 is an historical inaccuracy.]

[2] Strauss, i 417; Volkmar, 364 f.

[3] [τῷ τε πατρὶ αὐτῆς ὑποτελεῖ. *Ant.* xviii 5. 1, Niese.]

[4] Hase, *Leben Jesu*, 4. Aufl., 149 f.; Volkmar, 357.

[5] v. 51, Anm. 2. [Cf. Schürer, i 363, Anm. 20.]

Lastly, there is a difficulty in the place of the supper. If St. John was confined at Machaerus, and the feast was held at Tiberias, how could the sentence have been forthwith put into execution, since the distance between the two places is about two days' journey[1]? Harmonistic writers suggest that the sentence need not have been immediately carried into effect[2]. But as St. Mark expressly says 'straightway' (vi 27), it seems better to suppose that the feast was not held at Tiberias at all. For during the rebuilding of Tiberias by Antipas it was found that there was a cemetery there, and the building was stopped: and even when the work was eventually completed, the tetrarch was obliged to settle there foreigners of unknown origin that the city might not remain uninhabited[3]. Moreover the palace there was adorned with figures of animals obnoxious to Jewish prejudice, which gave such offence to the Jews that at a later period they were destroyed[4]. All this would not have prevented the celebration of the feast in Tiberias had Antipas invited to it only his lords and chief captains. But he summoned also the 'chief estates' of Galilee (Marc. vi 21). It would have been strange if on such a day, even if it were not regarded as a day of mercy[5], Herod should have invited his guests to a place, a visit to which would have rendered those amongst them who were Jews unclean for a week[6]. Besides, he had equal facilities for preparing a feast at any of his other palaces. Some critics indeed even deny the possibility of preparing a feast at Machaerus: and although this is going too far—for it is well known that besides the stronghold there was there a palace with a multitude of exquisite and rare things[1]—I should myself prefer to place it at Sepphoris, which Antipas had made the metropolis of Galilee[2].

---

[1] Strauss, i 418; Volkmar, 369. Strauss, however, supposes that the feast may have taken place at Machaerus.

[2] Fritzsche, quoted by Strauss.

[3] *Ant.* xviii 7. 2; Hausrath, 294.

[4] *Vita*, § 12.

[5] Keim, ii 513, mentions the release of Silas, a military commander and benefactor of Agrippa, who was liberated on the birthday of the latter. But the case is not decisive; Silas remained in prison. *Ant.* xix 7. 1.

[6] *Ant.* xviii 2. 3.

It is also possible that Josephus is incorrect in placing the imprisonment of St. John at Machaerus. For in the first place the Baptist was preaching not on the confines of Peraea and Arabia, but between Galilee and Peraea. In the absence, therefore, of special reasons (upon which both the Gospels and Josephus are silent), Machaerus would be the last possible place of confinement. It was on the borders of the dominions of Aretas, to whom the proximity of the champion of his daughter could only be an advantage. And since according to the Gospels the request of Herodias was carried out, if not during the supper, at any rate immediately after it, St. John's place of confinement and the place where the feast was held must have been one and the same. But St. Mark, who records that the chief estates of Galilee were invited to the feast, makes no mention of the chief estates of Peraea, in which Machaerus was situated. It is perhaps easier, too, to think of Herod promising Salome the half of his possessions if the representatives of one of the two halves of his kingdom, namely, Peraea, were not present: and if they were not, the feast can hardly have taken place in their part of Herod's dominions.

II

Having so far defended the Gospel narrative against objections brought against it, it must be pointed out that the Gospels themselves do not permit us to rest content with Herodias as the only cause of the execution of St. John. If I am not mistaken there are indications of other factors in the Gospel narrative itself. In Marc. vi 26 it is said that the tetrarch would not refuse Salome's request because he had pledged his word to her. But it is added, 'and (for the sake of) them that sat at meat.' To draw any certain conclusion from these words is not possible. But they must be taken into account, and should have occurred to Keim, when, in collecting objections to the credibility of the Gospel, he asked if it was not incredible that none of those who took part in the feast protested against Salome's request [1]. Of course the simplest interpretation would be that Herod in the first place did not wish to break his promise, and secondly did not wish to appear as faithless to his word before his invited guests. But this explanation does not suit Marc. vi 22, according to which 'those that sat at meat with him' were pleased with the dancing, and appear to play an active, and not only a passive, rôle, so that it would be at least equally appropriate to interpret the words to mean that 'those that sat at meat' in some way supported Salome's request. This is a daring interpretation, but it is supported by the direct testimony of Christ Himself. 'I say unto you that Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. Even so shall the Son of Man also suffer of them' (Matt. xvii 12). Here it is quite definitely stated that the chief enemies of St. John were neither Herodias nor Herod, but those who were also the enemies of the Son of Man Himself. It is true that shortly afterwards the Pharisees tried to represent Herod as the enemy of prophets, for they came to Christ with a warning that Herod would kill Him also [2]. But the Saviour pointed at once to the true cause of the crime, when He answered that no prophet perishes anywhere but in Jerusalem. He cannot have meant to pass over absolutely the recent murder of the greatest of the Old Testament prophets, but seems to indicate that the act which was carried out in Galilee had its fundamental cause in Jerusalem.

---

[1] Hausrath, i 336.

[2] *Ant.* xviii 2. 1. [Cf. Schürer, i 366, Anm. 28, who argues for Machaerus.]

But who then were the enemies who 'knew not' the Baptist and did to him 'whatsoever they listed,' as they were also to do to Christ Himself? The proper designation for them is difficult to determine. Edersheim suggests the Pharisees. But as was said above (p. 508) he does not do more than allude to this fundamental cause of the Baptist's martyrdom [3], and can hardly have given himself the trouble of examining his own opinions; e.g. in this case it seems to escape his notice that elsewhere he describes the Scribes as the chief actors in the Sanhedrin [4]; and the Scribes, as he himself says, belonged not to the Pharisees alone, but to the Sadducees also[1]. The Pharisees would no doubt be indicated by analogous incidents in earlier history, such, for example, as their action in connexion with the government of Alexandria, after the death of Alexander Jannaeus[2]: and what is still more to the point, St. Luke narrates that Christ, when speaking in Jerusalem against the Sanhedrin on the subject of the Baptist's death, pointed to the Pharisees. All this is of course true, but the Pharisees as such were representatives of certain religious views, whereas in the enemies of the Baptist and Christ we have before us a political party. There appears, therefore, to have been a party comprising not only Pharisees and Sadducees, but also Scribes and 'the chief estates.' If we had to translate it into contemporary language we should term this party *national*. And since this would not be a strictly correct term[3], we may here make use of the most collective of the established terms, I mean that of 'Scribes.'

---

[1] Keim, ii 513.

[2] [Luc. xiii 31.]

[3] He does not even quote the most important passage, Matt. xvii 12 ff. [Eders., i 658].

[4] *Ibid.* i 93–6.

The distribution of responsibility in the event under discussion must have been that the 'Scribes' influenced Herodias, and Herodias acted on Herod Antipas. Since, then, everything depends ultimately upon the Scribes, it is important to determine the motives which underlay their action. Every one who has read the Gospels must have observed that after the message from the Sanhedrin to St. John (Jo. i 19 ff), and without any apparent cause, the 'Scribes' began to spread the report, 'he hath a devil' (Matt. xi 18). Prejudice against the prophet was conceived by them almost simultaneously with his appearance in the neighbourhood of the Jordan for the purpose of preaching.

Are we to suppose then that it was his preaching that led to his execution? Of course the dignity of the Scribes may have been offended by this impartial judge (Matt. iii 7), who, however, only exercised a right from time immemorial practised by the prophets, and recognized by all. But he did not suffer for the subject-matter of his preaching. In exhorting to an inward turning to God, he differed from the 'Scribes,' but he strictly observed the Mosaic law, and did not seek to deprive of their value any of the regulations of the traditional law. The moral state of the Jews he considered to be so hopeless that he threatened them with a rejection by God, and the creation of a new people out of 'these stones.' But he never rejected the Messianic view according to which the Messiah was to be exclusively Jewish. The 'Scribes' themselves testified to their agreement with his teaching when they entered into a union with his disciples against Christ, whose followers did not keep the commandments with respect to fasting and prayer (Marc. ii 18). Their hostility then could not have taken its rise here. Differences in degree did of course exist, but they were easily smoothed away by the consideration that it is one thing to preach an ideal standard of morals, and another to realize this ideal in practical life.

---

[1] Eders., i 311–3 [and 93].

[2] *Ant.* xiii 16. 2.

[3] In St. John's Gospel there seems to be an indication of the true name, the introduction of which would, however, require some preliminary discussion.

Keim[1] supposes that St. John suffered at the Scribes' hands for the sake of Christ, and that his death was the first disclosure of the carefully elaborated plan which was matured by the Jews when they realized what a gulf lay between the teaching of the God-man and their own ideals and conduct. But this view will not bear investigation. Keim's most important argument is based upon the supposition that after being informed of the death of the Baptist, Christ moved away into the territory of Philip. This is geographically incorrect. The synoptic Gospels record that Christ withdrew to a desert place. That it was not a literal desert is clear from the fact that all three synoptists hereupon record the feeding of the 5,000 (Matt. xiv 15 ff, Marc. vi 35 ff, Luc. ix 12 ff): and when we compare Jo. vi 1, we are led to conjecture that the deserted place was Herod's capital, Tiberias, so obnoxious to the Jews, near which the miracle took place. Nor do the Gospels, if thoughtfully interpreted, really connect the removal of Christ with St. John's death at all. Not only must the reason suggested in St. Mark and St. Luke, that the Apostles who had just returned from their mission required rest, also be taken into account: but the whole story of St. John's death is narrated here by St. Matthew and St. Mark out of its chronological order. They record first the fact that Herod heard of Christ and declared that John had risen from the dead. Then they give the account of the Baptist's execution. Obviously this cannot be regarded as an incident taken in its natural order and pointing the progress of the narrative. It is an incidental episode inserted to explain why Herod supposed that John had risen from the dead. Now we learn elsewhere [Luc. xxiii 8] that Herod not only remembered with chagrin his participation in the murder of John, but also greatly desired to see Jesus. Inasmuch as he did not deserve it, Christ moved away, not indeed out of his dominions, but far enough for Herod to see clearly that He did not condescend to vouchsafe to him any communion. Thus Christ withdrew because Herod wished to see Him, not because He had just received news of the death of the Baptist.

---

[1] ii 509 ff.

There is, therefore, no justification in this passage for the statement that St. John suffered for Christ. But Keim, although he tries to found his argument on the synoptic Gospels alone, must have had in mind Jo. i 29–30. We are there told that John testified to Christ. And of course the Scribes had accurate information of this testimony. Here, then, are possible grounds for supposing that the Baptist did suffer for his witness to Christ: and it is difficult not to agree with Keim that the cause which he suggests may have co-operated with others when the decision of the Scribes was once taken. But the chief cause of their action cannot be found here. If the Baptist suffered for his witness to Christ, the Scribes must already have decided that their hostility to Christ must be pushed to the bitter end. But an attentive study of the synoptic Gospels shows that as a matter of fact this decision was not arrived at until later, and that at the time of St. John's death their attitude to Christ had not yet been defined.

Perhaps it will be well to look at the question from another standpoint. Whatever the Scribes may have been, it is hardly possible to suppose that they endeavoured to compass the Baptist's death only on account of the past, and merely on account of his repeated proclamation of Christ as the Messiah. If they did unto the forerunner as they listed, they did so from fear with regard to the future, to prevent him from exercising his influence on the side of the Messiah and against them. What was this influence which they dreaded? Not simply a repetition of his former testimony. This would have been needless, for by that time the greater importance of 'the Bridegroom' had become recognized, not only by the 'friend of the bridegroom' but by the people. The Scribes could only fear the Baptist's influence if he actively participated in that aspect of the teaching of Christ according to which the Messiah was not the King of the Jews victorious over the national enemies, who would give to His people from the first supremacy over their foes, and reign for ever. St. John would have exercised such an influence if by his preaching he had emphasised that aspect of the truth of the kingdom of heaven which as it seems was the ultimate reason why the chiefs of the people gathered together against the Lord and against His Christ[1]. Of such an influence the Scribes were bound to stand in fear, and if their fear had found confirmation the Baptist would certainly have suffered at their hands for the sake of Christ.

But it is well known that a circumstance had occurred which made it evident that from this point of view the Scribes could have nothing against the Baptist: I mean the message sent by St. John to Christ with the question, 'Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another[2]?' Much ingenuity has been expended in trying to discover the reasons which induced St. John to ask this question, which seems so unnatural in view of the fact that St. John had himself answered it at an earlier period in so decided a manner. Some deny the historical character of the narrative[3], others explain it by referring to the spiritual condition of one who was in prison[4]. Others again have supposed that St. John sent his disciples not for his own sake, but that their faith might be confirmed by the words of Christ[5]. Other explanations are also possible[6]; but in any case it is indisputable that this incident would have the effect rather of setting at rest the misgivings of the Scribes with regard to St. John's attitude to Christ, than of exciting their fears: unless indeed they interpreted the question as a summons to Christ to proclaim Himself as the Messiah[1]. But at the time of the embassy the Scribes were well aware that no act of Christ could depend on a challenge from without, and that if in this case He had responded to the (assumed) request of St. John His action would have been out of harmony with His previous teaching about the suffering Messiah and the Son of Man. It may be worth while to add that if we refuse to credit the arbitrary invention of an alleged fear of the Scribes in respect of the Roman power, there can be no difficulty in maintaining that the Scribes could have found nothing to startle them in such a response of Christ to the Baptist's appeal, provided that He proclaimed Himself as the Messiah in the national Jewish sense of the term.

---

[1] [Acts iv 26, 27.]

[2] [Matt. xi 3.]

[3] Strauss, i 380 ff.

[4] This was expressed by Tertullian [*de Baptismo*, § 10], who thought that St. John's question implied doubt, and that this was occasioned by the spirit of God leaving him after his testimony to Christ. In this harsh form the view is supported by Meyer; in a milder form (temporary doubt that arose in prison) by Olshausen, 354 f., and Lange.

[5] This opinion was first expressed by Origen [see Cramer's Catena on Matt. xi 3].

[6] See, for instance, the interpretation of [St. Jerome (*Comm. in. Matt. ad loc.*: *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi vii. 67) and] St. Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Evangelia*, vi: *Opp.* ed. Bened. i. 1452), which opens up a new path.

Whatever we may believe as to the religious opinions of the Scribes, the plain words of the Saviour prevent us from regarding religious questions as the chief cause of the collision between the Baptist and his enemies (Matt. xi 18). We shall do well, therefore, to set the matter on a different footing. St. John from the very first sharply separated himself from the leaders of the people (Matt. iii 7). This, of course, would prejudice them against him all the more, since his preaching attracted multitudes from all parts of the country and made him a factor of which they found themselves obliged to take official notice. The Baptist's reply to the formal[2] interrogation of the Sanhedrin produced still greater estrangement. Whilst refusing to claim for himself the Messianic unction, or the mission of Elias, or the dignity of 'the prophet,' he called himself a forerunner in the sense of one who was to make straight the ways of the people, that they might be worthy to receive Christ (Jo. i 20–3). Such a reply would not remove prejudice, but on the other hand the conduct of the Baptist gave no particular cause for alarm. The question of cleansing through baptism, although it caused disputes (Jo. iii 25), did not prevent the disputants from acting together.

---

[1] See e. g. Wolffii *Curae philolog. et crit. in* iv *Evangelia* (ed. 3), Hamburg, 1739, i 190.

[2] Edersheim, i 309, supposes this to have been an unofficial deputation. But cf. Jo. i 22, 24.

The righteousness preached by the Baptist was in theory inculcated by the Scribes also, even if it was practically denied by them. And the refusal to be called 'the prophet' had to be understood as a refusal on the part of the Baptist to introduce into his preaching even such political considerations as preceding prophets had admitted. Consequently St. John continued to preach and to baptize without let or hindrance. He was 'not yet cast into prison.'

Probably matters might have continued on this footing if the unlucky personality of Herod had not become involved in the matter. Throughout the whole of his life there was not a trait which could appear unstained in the sight of the people. On his father's side he was the son of that Herod the Great who not only provoked aversion as a foreign governor, but who tried to suppress the last vestige of the popular power represented in the Sanhedrin[1]. On his mother's side he was not of Asmonean origin, not even, like Philip, the son of a woman of Jerusalem, but was son of a Samaritan[2], and full brother of Archelaus, who so deservedly incurred the hatred of the Jews. His education he received at Rome[3], and he adopted the habits of a heathen. By his marriage with the daughter of Aretas he became allied to a people who were the bitter enemies of the Jews[4]. And as governor he obediently carried out the Roman policy[5]. Without opposing fundamental Hebrew beliefs, he suffered himself to openly break those regulations which the Scribes regarded as more obligatory than justice, mercy, and faith[6]. As tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea he prevented[7] Agrippa, who not only belonged to the Asmonean family of Simon the Just, but strictly kept 'all the customs of the fathers[8]' and successfully represented Jewish interests at the Roman court[9], from becoming governor over all the Jewish dominions. And to crown all he had formed round him the Herodian party, who were devoted to him[1]. In a word the person of Herod was obnoxious and dangerous to all who, from whatever motive, had undertaken the preservation of the national existence. And the Baptist stood in close relations to Herod. The Gospels testify to that with perfect clearness. 'Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy, and kept him safe. And when he heard him he did many things, and he heard him gladly' (Marc. vi 20).

---

[1] *Ant.* xiv 9. 4; xv 1. 1.

[2] Josephus calls her Malthace [e. g. *Ant.* xvii 10. 1].

[3] *Ant.* xvii 1. 3.

[4] *Ibid.* xviii 5. 1 et passim.

[5] Ewald, v 50, Anm. 1, on the authority of Mionnet, supposes that, 'the crafty Antipas' found means to dispense with the representation of the Roman Caesar on the coinage. But Matt. xxii 16, 21 shows that, although Mionnet did not discover any (Roman) coins of Antipas' reign, they did exist. [On the coins of Herod Antipas cf. Schürer, i 361, Anm. 16, and the literature there referred to.]

[6] Cf. what was said above (p. 515) as to the site of Tiberias, and the ornamentation of the palace with figures of animals.

[7] I should so understand *Ant.* xviii 7. 1, 2.

[8] *Ant.* xix 6. 1, 3.

[9] *Ibid.* xviii 8. 7; xix 5. 2.

It is true that attempts have been made to limit the close relations here described to the period of the Baptist's imprisonment. But the evangelist affords us an opportunity of assuring ourselves of the arbitrary character of this limitation. He connects the verse just quoted with the statement that Herodias desired the death of John, and uses it as an explanation of the fact that her wish was not immediately carried out by Herod. Herod must certainly soon have found out that in casting St. John into prison he by no means satisfied the hatred of Herodias. He evidently did not wish to increase his guilt to the extent of complying with her murderous wishes. Yet he did not seek for opportunities of thwarting her. How could he have engaged in direct communication with the imprisoned Baptist, a course of action which would increase her desire for the execution of the latter? The idea of such communication arose from the supposed 'privileged position' of the confined Baptist, which again is deduced from the free access to him of his disciples, though even Weiss is obliged to admit the hasty character of this inference in view of Acts xxiv 23. We do not deny the possibility of such intercourse, but Herod would have had to use all his craft to keep it from the knowledge of Herodias. Moreover, St. Luke (iii 19) states that the denunciation of his unlawful marriage was the last rebuke which Antipas heard from the Baptist, but not the only one: on the contrary, every wrong action of the tetrarch was duly reproved by the prophet, a state of things which presupposes much more than a transitory influence during St. John's imprisonment. This testimony of St. Luke to prolonged and systematic relations between the Baptist and the tetrarch confirms the natural meaning of the words already quoted from Marc. vi 20.

---

[1] Ewald, 46 f.

Another attempt to resist the conclusion we have drawn from the statement in St. Mark is made by substituting the *varia lectio* ἠπόρει for ἐποίει. Herod, it is said, did not 'do many things when he heard him,' but 'was much perplexed[1].' But ἠπόρει, though a very old reading, is not original[2], and even if it were original it would suggest much more than the transient, ineffective feeling of pleasure at hearing a powerful orator. Thus with either reading this verse testifies to an active influence of St. John, whose widespread authority the Scribes had occasion to know so well, upon a ruler with whom they were engaged in a struggle where success seemed to depend either on some false step of Herod, or on his becoming amenable to an influence favourable to the Scribes. Here lies hidden the chief cause of the Baptist's death.

III

Thus the Scribes 'knew not' the Baptist (Matt. xvii 12). They could not believe that he was working exclusively in the interests of moral truth (Matt. xxi 32). What other point of view could they have, save that political outlook which united them, notwithstanding the fact that in beliefs they belonged to widely differing sects? From this political standpoint they could only see that the Baptist pointed not to Jerusalem, but to another centre of interest—the Light from the east. With his influence upon the tetrarch and his authority in the eyes of the people, he might prove a firm support for Antipas, a possibility which clashed with the interests which lay nearest to their hearts. It was direct personal animosity which in the moments of their greatest exasperation provoked the slander, 'he hath a devil' (Matt. xi 18, Luc. vii 33). The people, however, paid no attention to this charge, and continued to treat the prophet with the greatest respect (Luc. iii 29). This of course only inflamed the Scribes the more, and invited them to a course of action which had succeeded in the case of others [1]. How they carried out their design is described in the narratives of the first two Gospels.

---

[1] Edersheim, i 666. [ἠπόρει, ℵ B L Cop. ἐποίει the Western authorities, including D, the Latin MSS and the Lewis Syriac].

[2] As regards the origin of ἠπόρει there are two equally possible explanations. Either it was desired to show that under the influence of the Baptist Herod began to think doubtfully of his unlawful marriage, which he had before justified on political grounds; or by ἠπόρει is meant that the preaching of St. John had affected the entire life of Antipas. The words which follow, 'and heard him gladly,' must then mean that Herod was inclined to reform his life, and would express an idea of gradual improvement, absent from the received text, in which there appears first the thought of obedience in matters of practice, and then the idea of simple hearing.

The Gospels also enable us to solve another question—how it was that Herod put the Baptist to death in apparent disregard of his own interests. The Gospels point out that Herod transferred the responsibility of this action to others, and thus secured himself against the rebellion of the people by sheltering himself behind the elders who took part in the feast. They do not leave unmentioned the ceaseless importunities of Herodias, which were well calculated to act upon the sensuous nature of the tetrarch, and at a later period did in fact bring him into disgrace and exile. Lastly, in the words of Christ they lay bare the perfidy which was perhaps Herod's most characteristic trait (Luc. xiii 32). This passage is an answer to the hypocritical warning grounded on the Baptist's fate; and therefore the name, 'that fox,' given here to Herod, evidently stands in close relationship with the dark deed of the Baptist's execution.

Herod of course knew that no considerations of a political nature could change the Baptist's opinion of his adulterous marriage. Therefore so long as the marriage remained undissolved, he could expect from St. John no renewal of his former relations to him. This is the negative aspect of the case. On the positive side Herod had no need to guess the participation of the Scribes in the importunity of Herodias. The latter could not have concealed it, and, as St. Mark records, Herod granted Salome's request 'for the sake also of those which sat with him.' Plainly, by this time, he was far from disinclined to sacrifice the Baptist to the Scribes. And indeed it is hardly possible to doubt that much earlier than this Herod was making overtures to the Scribes in marrying Herodias. No one can suppose that the Asmonean princess at fifty years of age could have so captivated Herod as to make him not only offend his brother, but also forget that he had married an Arabian wife to insure his dominions against attack [2]. What he did by his alliance with Herodias was to change his position and put an end to his strained relations with the leaders of the Jewish people. And in condemning the Baptist to death, he made his connexion with them still closer.

---

[1] *Ant.* xiii 16. 2.

[2] Hausrath, i 293.

It may be considered doubtful how far he had reasons of his own for this change of front. But there are some indirect data. On paper Herod was already 'king'[1], and after his father had changed his will[2] he did not give up his aspirations after royalty, but went to Rome to wrest the title from his brother Archelaus[3]. The fact that at a later period he prepared armour for 70,000 men[4] makes it improbable that he ever gave up this hope. Agrippa, in his denunciation of Herod, explained these preparations as proof of his intention of revolting against the Romans. But nothing is more improbable, though the accusation (together with Agrippa's presents) was sufficient for the emperor Gaius. It might have been supposed that Herod intended these preparations for the war against Aretas, but he understood well enough that it was more convenient to conquer the Arabian king through Rome than in direct war[5]. No other enemy was attacking him, and yet besides storing the armour he entered into an agreement with the Parthians[6], who played an active part in the Jewish history of the period[7]. It is simplest to suppose that Herod still fostered the hope of becoming king instead of Agrippa, and that he intended to keep the power thus acquired by force of arms if necessary. But the Scribes were on the side of Agrippa, and Herod knew that they had been able to deprive Archelaus of his kingdom. On his own side he had the Baptist[8], who, however, was not likely to assist him in his ambitious projects. Therefore he changed front. First he married Herodias, and then, falling lower still, he sacrificed the Baptist without understanding that he had deprived himself of his own mainstay and had become his own enemy.

But his eyes seem soon to have been opened. At all events, he gladly received news of Christ, hoping that in Him the Baptist had risen. Critical writers refuse to him even this tardy recognition of his folly. How, it is asked, could Herod, a Sadducee, believe in the resurrection of the dead [1]? But in defence of the Gospel it must be pointed out that Herod's Sadduceeism is very doubtful. It is deduced from a comparison of Marc. viii 15 and Matt. xvi 6, where Christ, after warning His disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees, adds that they should beware of the leaven of Herod as one Gospel records it, or of the leaven of the Sadducees according to the other. But the context shows that the Saviour was warning His disciples against false conceptions of the Messiah—the materialism of the Pharisees on the one hand, the nihilism of the Sadducees and of Herod on the other. And besides, that Herod should express the conviction that in Christ John had risen again, did not necessarily imply that he believed in the resurrection of the dead, or even (as one harmonistic writer suggests)[2] in the transmigration of souls! He merely gave utterance to the idea that in Christ he might perhaps find again that other who had been lost to him through his own crime.

---

[1] *Ant.* xvii 6. 1.

[2] *Ibid.* xvii 8. 1.

[3] *Ibid.* xvii 9. 4.

[4] *Ibid.* xviii 7. 2.

[5] *Ibid.* xviii 5. 1.

[6] *Ibid.* xviii 7. 2.

[7] [Schürer, i 371: Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, ch. ix.]

[8] The Herodians need not be taken into account. According to Ewald, v 47, in important cases they showed themselves very weak.

---

[1] e.g. Volkmar, 359.

[2] Olshausen, i 472.

S. SOLLERTINSKY.

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS. II.

IN the January number of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES I discussed, sufficiently I think for the present purpose, some questions preliminary to an understanding of the evidence of Eusebius with regard to the four episcopal lists which he gives us in his *History* and his *Chronicle*[1]—those of the churches of Rome Alexandria Antioch and Jerusalem. In this second paper I propose to approach the consideration of the lists themselves, and to begin with that of Jerusalem, which is quite independent of the other three and is involved in curious complications of its own.

THE JERUSALEM LIST.

For this list our only authorities are Eusebius and later oriental writers whose lists are closely related to, if they are not dependent on, that of Eusebius. It will be convenient in the first instance to concentrate attention on Eusebius alone.

The first and most important point is one which Eusebius himself is careful to press upon our notice, for it distinguished apparently his Jerusalem 'source' from the source or sources on which he drew for the other three churches: *he had a list of names, but no dates were attached to them.* After recording in the *History*, under the reign of Hadrian, the duration of the episcopate of the then bishop of Rome and the then bishop of Alexandria, he goes on to contrast his knowledge of the succession at Jerusalem: 'but the chronology of the bishops at Jerusalem I have nowhere found written out and preserved,'

---

[1] When that article was written, the work of Schoene, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus* (Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, A. D. 1900), had not yet appeared. I hope to be able to say something of it on a future occasion. It is matter for regret that Schoene has definitely renounced the intention of revising and reissuing his edition of the *Chronicle*, since the recently discovered material renders a new edition imperative.

(τῶν γε μὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπισκόπων τοὺς χρόνους γραφῇ σωζομένους οὐδαμῶς εὗρον, *H. E.* iv 5). The tenor of this sentence would be quite against any limitation of its scope simply to the bishops down to Hadrian's time, and in fact the corresponding statement in the *Chronicle* occurs at a much later point, Commodus 6 = A.D. 185–186[1], *non potuimus discernere tempora singulorum eo quod usque in praesentem diem episcopatus eorum anni minime saluarentur*[2]. Since, further, the number of names in the list down to the beginning of the third century was unusually large—a point to which I shall have to recur more than once—Eusebius forbore all attempt to invent a separate date of accession for each, and massed them in groups; and as the grouping itself had for the most part to proceed on arbitrary lines, he has not even cared to make the groups identical in the *History* and the *Chronicle*. In the *History* thirteen bishops after James and Symeon, down to the final destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 135, are enumerated together (*H. E.* iv 5); in the *Chronicle* these are separated, the fourth to the ninth (inclusive) appearing under Trajan 14[3], A.D. 111–112, the remainder under Hadrian 7 or 8, c. A.D. 124. In the *History* the next fifteen bishops, after the foundation of the gentile city of Aelia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, are again catalogued on a single occasion (*H. E.* v 12)[4], and four more in *H. E.* vi 10; in the *Chronicle* the first name is given separately under Hadrian 19, A.D. 135–136, nine names are grouped under Antoninus Pius 23, A. D. 160–161, and nine again under Commodus 6, A.D. 185–186.

---

[1] On the system of reckoning the imperial years see the former article, pp. 187–192.

[2] Except where the contrary is specially stated, quotations from the *Chronicle* are given from the version of St. Jerome; see the former article, pp. 184–187. In this case the words *usque in praesentem diem* appear to be Jerome's own. The Syriac of Dionysius of Telmahar (Harnack, *Chronologie* p. 83) has for the last clause only *quia non tempus administrationis illorum consignatum est*, and the Armenian agrees with it. Jerome's version elsewhere betrays special knowledge of Jerusalem, in the story of the pig carved over the Bethlehem gate of Aelia (Hadrian 20); though his translation of the *Chronicle* preceded in time his residence at Bethlehem.

[3] Schoene gives Trajan 15 with one MS only; his other three agree with the Oxford MS on Trajan 14.

[4] Eusebius distinctly says *in loc.* that Narcissus, the last name here catalogued, was the fifteenth after the siege under Hadrian and thirtieth from the Apostles; but as a matter of fact only thirteen names are given. Comparison with the *Chronicle* shows that he has in the *History* accidentally omitted the eleventh and twelfth (or, counting from the beginning, the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh) names, Maximus and Antoninus.

That the origin of this dateless list of names is not to be sought in any Chronicle such as that of Julius Africanus[1] would be *a priori* at least highly probable, for a Chronicle cannot properly contain, and the Chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome does not in fact contain, any undated notices at all. It is true that mere lists of names unequipped with dates not only might be appended to a Chronicle as a species of *pièces justificatives*, but do actually appear in the Chronicle or *Liber Generationis* of Hippolytus, of which indeed they constitute the most important element; but Eusebius leaves us in no real doubt that his source here was local tradition. Palestinian Caesarea was still when Eusebius was born there, as it had been in the time of the Apostles, the civil capital of the province to which Aelia-Jerusalem belonged. The bishops of the two churches, Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem, had together presided over a Palestinian synod on the Easter question at the end of the second century, the Acts of which were still extant when Eusebius wrote (*H. E.* v 23). That the historian himself should investigate on the spot the records of a church at once so nearly connected with his own, and locally at least the inheritor of the *origines* and holy places of Christianity, was natural and inevitable. And the christians of Jerusalem, it is clear, were not behindhand in satisfying the curiosity of their visitor. They showed him the Chair of St. James; they related to him all the marvels which local tradition had handed down about their bishop Narcissus[2]. Narcissus had by his prayers turned water into oil—after the example of the miracle at Cana—when oil for the lights ran out during the service of the Paschal Vigil, and tiny quantities of the miraculous oil were still preserved and shown by many of the faithful. He had been calumniated on charges which his three accusers had maintained by invoking against themselves, if their statements were untrue, fire, wasting disease, loss of sight: and the fate which each of the calumniators had invoked came in turn to pass. He had mysteriously disappeared, no man knew whither, to embrace the ascetic life; his third successor in the episcopate was ruling when once more he returned, as suddenly as he had gone, and was called upon again to exercise his office. His age was now so great that he was unable even to celebrate the Liturgy, and a Cappadocian bishop, Alexander, was chosen to rule with him and to succeed him; though, as it was contrary to all precedents that a bishop should be translated [1], or that two bishops should be ruling in the same church, revelations came in to overcome the difficulty, and, as Eusebius heard the story, not only was Alexander supernaturally summoned to Jerusalem, but to all the most zealous members of the Jerusalem community (*τοῖς μάλιστα αὐτῶν σπουδαίοις*) was granted an identical vision of their meeting the predestined coadjutor outside the city gates.

---

[1] See the previous paper, pp. 194–196.

[2] *H. E.* vii 19 *οἱ τῇδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀδελφοὶ σαφῶς τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐπιδείκνυνται*; vi 9 *πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα παράδοξα οἱ τῆς παροικίας πολῖται ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀδελφῶν τοῦ Ναρκίσσου μνημονεύουσιν, κ.τ.λ.* It is probably the special position of the Jerusalem christians, and what seemed to Eusebius (mistakenly) their special claim to be the exponents of a trustworthy tradition from the beginning of things, that leads him to employ the phrase 'succession' in both passages.

Naturally then these same christians of Jerusalem were not behindhand when the bishop of Caesarea questioned them as to their possession of a trustworthy account of their episcopal succession. They produced him a written list reaching back to the age of the Apostles. *Ἐξ ἐγγράφων*, 'from a written source,' is the phrase by which Eusebius in the *History* (iv 5) defines his authority for the assertion that fifteen bishops, all of them Jews, preceded the siege under Hadrian; in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* (iii 5; I take the passage from Harnack, p. 219 n) he says still more precisely that the first bishops in the succession down to Hadrian's siege were Jews, 'whose names are still found on record with the christians of the locality,' *ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα εἰσέτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις μνημονεύεται.*

The purpose of this paper is to ask, What is the value of the list which was thus propounded to Eusebius at Jerusalem as representing the tradition of the local church?

We turn in the first place to external evidence, and we ask what is known, whether through Eusebius himself or through other witnesses, of the history of this church of Jerusalem in the first three centuries.

---

[1] Alexander's translation was the earliest instance known to the historian Socrates, *H. E.* vii 36.

1. Eusebius had at his disposal—besides the list of bishops which is in question—for the first two centuries after Pentecost at least four Palestinian authorities, whose writings bore more or less upon the subject, and for the second half of the third century (he himself was born in A. D. 274) the recollections of actual contemporaries of the events narrated.

The Jewish historian Josephus[1] related the death of James, 'the brother of Jesus who is called Christ,' as occurring in the interval between the death of the procurator Festus and the arrival of his successor Albinus. But the date assigned in the *Chronicle*, Nero 7[2], A.D. 61–62, though it cannot be very far from the truth[3], is not given in Josephus, and was probably selected on more or less arbitrary grounds by Eusebius himself. From Josephus too (παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους) came the detail of the manner of St. James' death, *lapidibus opprimitur*.

Hegesippus, the Palestinian Christian, wrote his five books of *Memoirs* (now lost) not long after the middle of the second century. From them Eusebius drew (i) a lengthy account of the trial, confession, and martyrdom of St. James[4]; (ii) the statement that Clopas, father of Symeon, St. James' successor, was brother of Joseph, so that Symeon was 'cousin' to our Lord[5]; (iii) the information that this same Symeon was martyred by crucifixion under the reign of Trajan and governorship of Atticus[1].

---

[1] *Antiquities* XX ix 1, quoted in *H. E.* ii 23: see below, p. 536 n. 3.

[2] Harnack (p. 130) has rightly seen that this (and not Nero 8) is the correct year; two of Schoene's MSS already gave it, and we can now add the Oxford MS.

[3] Festus arrived as procurator in all probability either in A. D. 58 or 59; see my article, *Chronology of the New Testament: Apostolic Age*, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* i 419–420. Albinus was already in office at the Feast of Tabernacles in the fourth year before the outbreak of the war (*Jewish War* VI v 3), i. e. in the autumn of A. D. 62.

[4] *H. E.* ii 23. According to Hegesippus St. James was thrown down from a pinnacle of the Temple, then stoned, and finally killed by a fuller with his club. When Clement of Alexandria in the Seventh Book of his *Outlines* (quoted in Eus. *H. E.* ii 1) distinguishes this St. James as ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερυγίου βληθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ κναφέως ξύλῳ πληγεὶς εἰς θάνατον, he was certainly drawing from Hegesippus.

[5] *H. E.* iii 11. The form Clopas is given in the Greek text of the *History*, both here and in a definite quotation from Hegesippus in *H. E.* iii 32. On the other hand, both translations of the *History*, Rufinus and the Syriac, appear to give Cleophas; and in the *Chronicle*, Trajan 10, the name is Cleopas (Cleophas) according to the Paschal Chronicle, the Armenian, and both Syriac epitomes; in Jerome Schoene prints *Clopae*, but two of his four MSS read *Cleopae*, and they are now reinforced by the Oxford MS. Similar confusion prevails over the name of his son the bishop. Symeon is the only form known in the *History*, whether in the words of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii 11, 22, 32, 35) or in those of Hegesippus (quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 32); but in the *Chronicle*, Nero 7, he is called *Symeon qui et Simon* (so all

Aristo of Pella was another Jewish Christian author, somewhat older than Hegesippus, from whom Eusebius drew his knowledge of the edict of Hadrian, forbidding all Jews even to approach the site of what had once been Jerusalem[2]. Harnack suggests (p. 130) that from him may have come, too, the information that Marcus was the first Gentile bishop, which, both in the *History* and in the *Chronicle*, immediately follows. But Aristo of Pella was only (so far as can be ascertained) the author of a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian, Jason and Papiscus, which is not very likely to have contained historical information about the Jerusalem episcopate. And I see no reason to doubt that it was the Jerusalem list itself which contained, together with the notice of the close of the Jewish succession of bishops, a notice of the commencement of the Gentile line: see below, Table I, p. 541.

Equally unsuccessful is the attempt which has been made to see in Julius Africanus a 'source' for Eusebius in relation to the church of Jerusalem. It is true that Africanus lived in Palestine, not very far from Aelia-Jerusalem. But Harnack rightly points out (p. 129) that Aelia in Africanus' day was a place of no special importance; and in fact there is no single piece of information about its history in Eusebius which can plausibly be referred to him. Chronologically precise notices about Jerusalem do not begin in Eusebius till after the time when Africanus wrote, and the details about Africanus' contemporaries, the two bishops Narcissus and Alexander (*H. E.* vi 9–11), come, as we have seen, from Jerusalem tradition, reinforced only by a fragment of Alexander's correspondence[3].

---

authorities; Schoene in Jerome prints Simo for Simon with only one MS), while under Trajan 10 Jerome and the Paschal Chronicle call him Simon—probably rightly—the Armenian and Syriac Simeon. Where did the name Simon come from? from the Jerusalem list?

[1] *H. E.* iii 32. Harnack (p. 129) translates ἐπὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ, 'under the proconsul of Syria, Atticus' (whom he then identifies with Sextus Attius Suburanus, consul in A.D. 104): but ὑπατικός = *consularis* not *proconsul*, and in fact neither the governor of Judaea nor the legate of Syria would ever have been called 'proconsul.'

[2] *H. E.* iv 6, cf. *Chronicle* Hadrian 18.

[3] *H. E.* vi 11. This letter, written to the people of Antinoe (in Egypt), was in Eusebius' time 'preserved with us,' παρ' ἡμῖν, which perhaps suggests the library at Caesarea rather than the archives of the church of Jerusalem.

Apart then from a single statement in Josephus, at the latest point where the Jewish writer was likely to be brought into contact with the history of the christians of Jerusalem, Hegesippus remains so far the only authority from whom we have reason to know that Eusebius drew. But there are still left a few statements made by Eusebius without indication of source, and we proceed to ask whether these or any of them can be referred to Hegesippus or, if not, whether any new authority must be postulated outside the Jerusalem list and Jerusalem tradition.

(*a*) At the beginning of the Second Book of the *History*, Eusebius announces his intention of investigating 'the events that followed the Ascension, noting some things out of the divine scriptures and adding others from other records which we shall as occasion offers mention.' He first narrates from the Acts the election of Matthias and ordination of the Seven, with the martyrdom of Stephen, and proceeds according to his programme to reinforce the canonical by external matter[1]. 'Then (τότε δῆτα) too James who was called brother of the Lord, for he too was named son of Joseph . . . this James then, whom because of his superiority in virtue the ancients surnamed the Just, was the first they tell us to be entrusted with the throne of the episcopate of the church in Jerusalem'; or more definitely in the *Chronicle*, Tiberius 19 (the year after the Crucifixion) = A.D. 32–33, 'James the brother of the Lord is ordained bishop by the apostles,' compare *H. E.* ii 23 πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων; in *H. E.* vii 19 it is even 'at the hands of the Saviour himself and the Apostles.' This reckoning of the episcopate of James from the Ascension—the Liberian list shows a similar procedure in regard to St. Peter's Roman episcopate—goes back, I cannot doubt, to Hegesippus himself[2], for the quotation in *H. E.* ii. 23 begins with words which exactly satisfy the statement of Eusebius in ii 1, 'And together with the apostles James the brother of the Lord succeeds to the church, he who was called Just by all men from the Lord's time down to our own.' What Hegesippus meant by διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων was that James together with the apostles succeeded to the (government of the) Church after the Lord himself. It is probable indeed that he expressly said that our Lord had himself entrusted the episcopate of the church at Jerusalem to James, since not only Eusebius (*H. E.* vii 19 *ut sup.*) but the Clementine Recognitions and Epiphanius repeat the statement, and no common source is so likely as Hegesippus[1].

---

[1] Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 229) is wrong, I am sure, in supposing that the episcopate of St. James is here meant to be placed *after* the death of Stephen; it is only that the non-canonical is placed *after* the canonical record.

[2] Clement of Alexandria too uses the phrase μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος of St. James' episcopate (*H. E.* ii 1, from the Sixth Book of the *Outlines*), and we have already seen that Clement draws on Hegesippus for the history of St. James. On the other hand, the statement that St. James was 'ordained by the Apostles' may perhaps have been derived by Eusebius only from this passage of Clement—where Peter, James, and John are said to have chosen James the Just bishop of Jerusalem—and not go back to Hegesippus himself.

(*b*) The notice that 'after the martyrdom of James and the taking of Jerusalem which immediately followed, the survivors of the apostles and personal disciples of the Lord together with the Lord's kinsmen after the flesh' met at Jerusalem to elect the successor of St. James (*H. E.* iii 11) is introduced with the words λόγος κατέχει, 'the story holds.' Bp. Lightfoot thought that this phrase in Eusebius always means 'authentic and trustworthy information.' Harnack, on the other hand, while going further than Lightfoot in connecting it with written sources, holds the exactly opposite opinion of the value implied—'a source which for some reason or in some respect is not quite to be relied on[2].' Perhaps it is truer to say that Eusebius in using it carefully abstains, so far as the words themselves go, from giving an estimate of value one way or the other. Anyhow there is nothing in this particular case that militates against the authorship of Hegesippus, who is named (in connexion with the relationship of Clopas and Joseph) in the immediate neighbourhood. The truth of the story itself is another matter; it is difficult to suppose that the Jerusalem church was left without a head for at least eight years—since James was martyred at latest in A.D. 62, and the siege was not over till A.D. 70[3]—so that, whatever basis there may be for the rest of the story, its chronology at least is unsatisfactory.

---

[1] Clem. Recogn. i 43; Epiph. *Haer.* lxxviii 7. I take these references from Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi 229, 230, who has, however, overlooked the important reference to Eusebius; nor can I quite gather whether he sees the real meaning of the phrase διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων as I have just interpreted it in the text.

[2] Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*^{1} i 58 n; Harnack, *Chronologie* p. 128 n.

[3] Even if with Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 302) we reject the whole account of James' martyrdom in Josephus as a fabrication, and place it rather with Hegesippus at the Passover of A. D. 66, four or five years still remain to be accounted for; though in this case it is true that the war would be a sufficient explanation.

(*c*) With the same phrase λόγος κατέχει is introduced the explanation of the absence of any extant chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem. Eusebius had nowhere found their dates recorded, 'for the story holds that they were very short-lived,' *κομιδῆ γὰρ οὖν βραχυβίους αὐτοὺς λόγος κατέχει γενέσθαι* (*H. E.* iv 5). The most natural explanation seems to me here to be that the historian asked his informants at Jerusalem why there were no dates to their list and why there were so many names on the rolls of the see, and that the explanation that they were all very short-lived was the answer to both these questions. In this case λόγος κατέχει would mean no more than the local tradition of the church at Jerusalem as it existed in Eusebius' day.

With these notices the information given in Eusebius of Jerusalem affairs down to the middle of the third century is exhausted; and the point that needs to be borne in mind is that, apart from Hegesippus and three individual notices (that in Josephus, Narcissus' Paschal synod, and the letter of Alexander), Eusebius had nothing at his command by which the value of the Jerusalem traditions could be checked; and in particular, that between the martyrdom of Symeon under the Emperor Trajan at the beginning of the second century, and the participation of Narcissus in a synod on the Paschal question in the papacy of Victor at its close, there is no single fact given us, other than the destruction of Jerusalem and foundation of Aelia Capitolina about A.D. 135, which can confirm or even illustrate the episcopate of any one out of nearly thirty bishops. Whether authorities other than Eusebius come to our rescue here, is a question which I shall ask in a moment.

On the other hand, from the middle of the third century Eusebius becomes an almost contemporary authority, and could derive his information from eye-witnesses. That in the persecution of Decius, A.D. 250, bishop Alexander confessed Christ at Caesarea and died in prison, being succeeded by Mazabanes[1]—that after about fifteen years' episcopate Mazabanes was followed by Hymenaeus 'who was famous through a long period of years of our own day[1]'—that not long before the great persecution Hymenaeus died, and that, after the brief episcopate of Zabdas, Hermon occupied the 'throne' of St. James during the persecution itself[2]—all this may be accepted without hesitation, and needs no further examination. It is only for so much of the Jerusalem list as precedes the death of Alexander that fresh light must be sought in the authorities whose information adds to that given by Eusebius.

---

[1] So the *History*, vi 39, with Syncellus; Jerome has Mazabanus, and so according to Schoene the Armenian; the only Syriac epitome which contains the notice gives Mazabana. Epiphanius' list goes with Jerome's.

2. The sources other than Eusebius available for our present purpose are five in number: Epiphanius and four chronographers of the ninth and tenth centuries, namely Syncellus, Nicephorus, the Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον, and Eutychius.

Epiphanius (whose book on *Heresies* was published c. A.D. 375) having occasion in his 66th chapter to mention the claim of the Manichaeans that their founder Manes was himself the Spirit promised to the disciples, meets it by cataloguing all the bishops who succeeded one another in Jerusalem between the days of the apostles and the appearance of Manes in the reigns of Aurelian and Probus, A.D. 270–282 (ed. Oehler, ii 432). It is possible that he selected the Jerusalem succession for this purpose just because the number of names in it was so abnormally large, every name adding of course additional weight to an argument which turned on Manes' remoteness from the apostles: it is possible also that Epiphanius' personal connexion with Palestine—he was a native of Eleutheropolis near Jerusalem—had something to do with it. His list enumerates thirty-seven names from James to Hymenaeus, in the course of which some dozen or more synchronisms with the imperial chronology—sometimes vaguely to an emperor's reign, sometimes more precisely to a particular year in a reign—are inserted at irregular intervals. In this point of view he occupies a position intermediate between Eusebius, who gives hardly any notes of time, and the four writers now to be named who agree in attaching to each bishop's name the number of years of his episcopate.

---

[1] *H. E.* vii 14. The *History* gives no precise date, so that the Valerian 13 of the *Chronicle*, = A. D. 265–266, rests on the approximate results of Eusebius' personal investigation, not on written authority.

[2] The *Chronicle* gives the year Diocletian 15, = c. A. D. 299, for Zabdas, and Diocletian 18, = c. A. D. 302, for Hermon.

George Syncellus, an official of the church of Constantinople, composed his *Chronographica* about the year A.D. 800. It is one of the chief sources from which portions of the original Greek of Eusebius' *Chronicle* can be recovered. Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A.D. 828, was the author of a *Chronographica Brevis* to which was appended his celebrated Stichometry of canonical and deutero-canonical books. The author of the Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον discovered by Mai, which professes to be constructed 'out of the labours of Eusebius,' is unknown: but he wrote in A.D. 853. These three are Greek writers: the fourth, Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, whose *Annales* reach down to A.D. 937, wrote in Arabic[1].

The first table which follows deals only with the variations in the names of the bishops of Jerusalem down to Alexander as we have them in Eusebius, Epiphanius, and the four later authorities, and does not touch questions of date. In the first column I give the list which Eusebius received at Jerusalem as reconstructed from the *History* and the *Chronicle*: in only two cases does there appear to be any room for doubt, namely No. 14 where the *History* has Joseph and the *Chronicle* probably Joses, and No. 21 where the *History* has Gaius and all authorities for the *Chronicle* Gaianus. That the list of Epiphanius in the second column is in some way related to the list of Eusebius is shown not only by the close agreement in number and order of names, but by the common notice (the only non-chronological notice in the Epiphanian list) which marks off the Gentile from the Jewish bishops; and if Epiphanius drew direct from one of Eusebius' two works, it must have been from the *Chronicle*, with which he agrees against the *History* in not omitting Nos. 26 and 27, Maximus and Antoninus, and in the orthography of Nos. 14 and 21, Josis and Gaianus. But the variations in the third and fourth names, where Epiphanius has Judas and Zacharias for the Justus and Zacchaeus of Eusebius, suggest that Epiphanius drew not from Eusebius but from Eusebius' source, that is, from the tradition of the christians of Jerusalem, to whom Epiphanius equally with Eusebius had had the advantage of near neighbourhood.

---

[1] On these four chronographers see Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome* i 240 ff, who only deals specially with their Roman lists, and Harnack, *Chronologie* i 92 ff, who prints and discusses their lists of all four successions, Rome Antioch Alexandria and Jerusalem. Since the terminology of Lightfoot and Harnack differs—both call the Anonymus A and Eutychius D; but whereas Lightfoot makes Nicephorus B and Syncellus C, Harnack inverts these two—I have thought it best in the table which follows to adhere to the chronological order, and to call Syncellus (1), Nicephorus (2), the Anonymus (3), and Eutychius (4). This has at once the advantage of showing which of them can have made use of which, and also brings next to one another the two pairs which examination shows to be most closely connected, Syncellus and Nicephorus, the Anonymus and Eutychius.

TABLE I.

I. Eusebius	II. Epiphanius *Haer.* lxvi 20	III.[2] (1)=Syncellus (2)=Nicephorus	IV.[2] (3)=Chron. Syntomon (4)=Eutychius
1. Iacobus	Iacobus		
2. Symeon ... ... *Chron. adds* qui et Simon	Symeon		
3. Iustus... ... ... 'Ιουδαῖός τις ὄνομα 'Ιοῦστος *H.E.* iii 35	Iudas ...	(1) (2) Iustus (1) *has also* Iudas ...	(3) (4) Iudas (3) *adds* ἀλλαχοῦ Iustus
4. Zacchaeus	Zacharias ...	(1) Zacchaeus (2) Zacharias	(3) (4) Zacchaeus
5. Tobias	Tobias		
6. Beniamin	Beniamin		
7. Ioannes	Ioannes		
8. Matthias ... ... Mattai Syr. a[3] Matathius Arm.	Matthias ...	(1) Matthaios ? (2) Matthaios	(3) Matthaios
9. Philippus	Philippus ...	...	(3) Philetus
10. Senecas ... ... Enecas Arm.	Senecas ...	(1) Enecas	
11. Iustus...	Iustus		
12. Leuis ... ... Leui Lat. Syr. Arm.	Leuis ...	(1) Leuis (2) Leui	(3) Moses, ἀλλαχοῦ Leues (4) Leui

---

The words used of the third bishop by Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 35, 'Ιουδαῖός τις ὄνομα 'Ιοῦστος, perhaps explain the confusion between Justus and Judas; I imagine that the Jerusalem list may have run either 'Ιουδαῖος 'Ιοῦστος or more probably 'Ιούδας 'Ιοῦστος.

[2] In these columns I only note divergences from the list of either Eusebius or Epiphanius or both.

[3] By Syr. a I mean the seventh or eight-century Syriac epitome of the *Chronicle* printed in Schoene ii 203 (Harnack p. 85): by Syr. b the ninth-century epitome of Dionysius of Telmahar (Harnack p. 83).

I. Eusebius	II. Epiphanius *Haer.* lxvi 20	III. (1)=Syncellus (2)=Nicephorus	IV. (3)=Chron. Syntomon (4)=Eutychius
13. Ephres ... ... Ephros Syr. a Aphros Syr. b Ephrem Arm.	Vaphris (Οὐάφρις) ...	(1) (2) Ephraim ...	(3) Ephraemias, ἀλλαχοῦ Ephraim (4) Ephraim
14. Ioses *uel* Ioseph ... Ioses Lat. Syr. b Iose Syr. a Ioseph *Hist.*: Arm. Lat. codd F P	Iosis	(1) (2) Ioseph	(3) Iosias, ἀλλαχοῦ Ioseph (4) Arsanius, *probably transliterated wrongly out of* Iosias
15. Iudas	Iudas		
All these of the circumcision.	These of the circumcision.		(3) *has the two historical notices*
Of the Gentiles:	And of the Gentiles these :		
16. Marcus	Marcus		
17. Cassianus	Cassianus		
			(3) (4) *add* Eusebius
18. Publius	Publius		
19. Maximus	Maximus		
20. Iulianus	Iulianus		
21. Gaianus *uel* Gaius ... Gaianus *Chron.* Gaius *Hist.*	Gaianus ...	(1) Gaius (2) Gaianus	(3) (4) Gaius
22. Symmachus	Symmachus		
23. Gaius	Gaius ...	...	(3) *omits* Gaius (4) *has* Gabianus, *app. for* Gaianus
24. Iulianus	Iulianus		
		(1) (2) *add* Elias ...	(3) (4) *add* Elias
25. Capito... ... ... Apion Arm.	Capito ...	(1) *has* Apion οἱ δέ Capiton	
26. Maximus ... ... Maximinus Arm. *omitted in Hist.*	Maximus ...	(1) (2) Maximus ...	(3) (4) Maximus
27. Antoninus ... ... *omitted in Hist.*	Antoninus ...	(1) (2) Antoninus ...	(3) (4) Antoninus
28. Valens	Valens		
29. Dolichianus ... ... *so Hist. and* Syr. a Dulichianus Arm. Lat. cod B Dulcianus Lat. codd O A P F Dulcinus Syr. b	Dolichianus	(2) Dulichianus	
30. Narcissus	Narcissus		
31. Dius	Dius		
32. Germanion	Germanion		
33. Gordius	Gordius ...	(1) Sardianus (2) Gordias	
34. Narcissus	Narcissus		(3) *omits* Narcissus
35. Alexander	Alexander		

With regard to the later lists, it is clear (i) that they have elements in common as against both Eusebius and Epiphanius, for all four agree in inserting an additional bishop, Elias, between Nos. 24 and 25, and substantially in calling No. 14 Ephraim: (ii) that among the four, Syncellus and Nicephorus go together as against the Anonymus and Eutychius, the last two inserting another additional bishop, Eusebius, between Nos. 17 and 18, and agreeing with Epiphanius in calling the third bishop Judas: (iii) that as with these exceptions there is no joint reading of any two of the four authorities which does not find some support in the various witnesses to the text of Eusebius, these lists again cannot be wholly unrelated to the Eusebian list. It is also clear, from what will be said in the succeeding pages, that the chronology of all four came (with several stages intervening) ultimately from a common source: and since Eusebius contained no chronology, the common source here was not Eusebius himself, but at most an authority who may, for matters other than chronological, have drawn from Eusebius direct; it is, however, also possible that the common source may have been early enough to have had immediate access, like Eusebius and Epiphanius, to the Jerusalem tradition. Of any influence of Epiphanius on the 'common source' of the four there is no trace[1], though at a later stage the Anonymus and Eutychius have possibly drawn from him in their Nos. 3 Judas and 14 Josias.

It will be noticed that two of these writers, Syncellus and the Anonymus, display a knowledge of more than one source. Four times the Anonymus prefaces with the word ἀλλαχοῦ, 'elsewhere,' a variant tradition: Nos. 3 Justus, 12 Leues, 13 Ephraim, 14 Joseph. These variants all correspond with names given by Syncellus, and as he wrote half a century before the Anonymus, I see no reason why their origin should not be looked for in him. With Syncellus himself the matter is not quite so simple. At No. 3 he has both Justus and Judas; and as his pair, Nicephorus, has only Justus, the Judas must have come in from outside. At No. 25 he has Ἀπίων οἱ δὲ Καπίτων: all other authorities give Capito (Καπίτων), *except the Armenian*

---

[1] I shall rather have to ask later on whether Epiphanius has not drawn his chronology from the 'common source.'

version of the Chronicle which reads Apion. Nor is this coincidence of Syncellus and the Armenian against the rest unique; for No. 10 they are the only two witnesses that give Enecas for Senecas. In both cases the two Syriac epitomes side with the majority: and it must be confessed that the grouping Syncellus-Armenian in favour of two such remarkable errors is a problem in the textual criticism of Eusebius not easy to explain[1].

But to return to the point from which I started, it does not seem that the four chronographers, even if they do go back for their list of names to the Jerusalem tradition, add anything from it which can modify the list of Eusebius-Epiphanius. Neither the Elias of all four, nor the Eusebius of the Anonymus and Eutychius, has any valid claim on the evidence as we know it to be inserted into the succession[2]. It is time then to turn from the investigation of the names of the Jerusalem list, to the investigation of the chronology as we find it fragmentarily in Epiphanius and completely in the four chronographers; beginning with the latter because of their completeness.

The primary results are, as was to be expected, the same for the chronology of the list as they were for its names. All four chronographers go back to a single original: for all four agree exactly in nineteen episcopates out of thirty-eight. Syncellus and Nicephorus agree exactly with one another in eleven more cases, the Anonymus and Eutychius in eleven more also: and if the two recensions be restored, as Harnack (p. 100) has restored them, they would have agreed apparently in thirty-one episcopates, while in seven they gave different figures. Six of the seven occur in the Jewish part of the list, and in each of them the Anonymus and Eutychius give a higher figure than the other two. The seventh relates to the separate rule of Alexander after Narcissus' death, and here Syncellus and Nicephorus exceed the others by seven or eight years.

The hypothesis of two editions of the *Chronicle* by Eusebius, which on other grounds Salmon Lightfoot and Schoene all accept, is doubtless the easiest way of accounting for the difficulty.

[2] Harnack (p. 102 n) accounts for Εὐσέβιος ἔτη β′ as a confusion of a marginal note which meant that the 'second,' i. e. the gentile, list of the historian began there. [If Cassianus (who precedes Eusebius in Anon. and Eut.) were indeed the chronographer of A.D. 147—see below, p. 547—the meaning might be that from this point Eusebius the historian was sole authority for the list.]

TABLE II.

Epiphanius	(1) Syncellus (2) Nicephorus	(3) Anonymus (4) Eutychius	A. D.
1. Iacobus	28	28	31
'was martyred in Jerusalem by being beaten with a club: down to Nero'			59
2. Symeon	23	26	
'was crucified under Trajan'			85
3. Iudas	[Iudas 7 Sync.] Iustus 6	Iudas 7	
4. Zacharias [Zacchaeus (1) (3) (4)]	4	9 or 7	
5. Tobias	4	5 or 3	
6. Beniamin	2	3	
7. Ioannes	2	2	
'until the nineteenth year of Trajan'			109
8. Matthias [Matthaeus (2) (3)]	2	2	
9. Philip [Philetus (3)] ...	2	2	
10. Senecas [Enecas (1)] ...	1	1	
11. Iustus	4	5	
'until Hadrian'			119
12. Leuis	4	5	
13. Vaphris	2	2	
14. Iosis...	2	3	
15. Iudas	2	2	
'down to Antoni(n)us 11'			131
'these were bishops of Jerusalem from the circumcision. And of the Gentiles these,'			
16. Marcus	8	8	
17. Cassianus	5	5	
		[Eusebius 2]	
18. Publius	5	5	
19. Maximus	4	4	
20. Iulianus	2	2	
'All these down to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius'			155
21. Gaianus [Gaius (1) (2) (3) (4)]	3	3	
22. Symmachus	2	2	
23. Gaius [*om.* (3): Gabianus (4)]	3	3	
'until the days of Verus, his eighth year'			163

Epiphanius	(1) Syncellus (2) Nicephorus	(3) Anonymus (4) Eutychius	A. D.
24. Iulianus	4 [Elias 2]	4 [Elias 2]	
25. Capito [Apion or Capito (1)]	4	4	
26. Maximus	4	4	
‘until Verus 16’			175
27. Antoninus	5	5	
28. Valens	3	3	
29. Dolichianus	[Narcissus 12	Dolichianus 4	
‘down to Commodus’	Sync.]		187
30. Narcissus	[Dolichianus Sync.] 4	Narcissus 12	
31. Dius	8	8	
‘until Severus’			207
32. Germanion	4	4	
33. Gordius	5	5	
‘until Antoninus’ [*sc.* Caracalla]			216
34. Narcissus the same	10	10	
‘until Alexander son of Mamaea, not the Macedonian but another’			226
35. Alexander	Alexander 15	7 or 8	
‘until the same Alexander’	‘the martyr’		233
36. Mazabanus	21	21	
‘until Gallus and Volusianus’			254
37. Hymenaeus	23	23	
‘until Aurelian’			277

Let us now compare these lists of the years of each episcopate with the notices in Epiphanius, and see whether any contact can be established or made probable between the fourth-century writer and one or other of the two recensions in which the complete chronology has come down to us.

If we turn to the Epiphanian list, as printed in the first column, we shall at once be able to account for certain of the appended notices as already familiar to us. From Hegesippus came the *data* that James was beaten to death at Jerusalem—though not the words ‘down to Nero’—and that Symeon was crucified under Trajan. From the Jerusalem list came the note about Jewish and Gentile bishops between the names Judas and Marcus[1]. And as we saw in the previous article (p. 193) that

---

[1] It is possible that all these three notices were taken by Epiphanius out of Eusebius. But we know that he had access to Hegesippus, and we have above seen it to be probable that he had access to the Jerusalem list.

Clement of Alexandria appears to quote a chronographer of the tenth year of Antoninus Pius, it is probable that this lost chronographer (of whom I shall speak in a moment) may also be the source of the note to No. 20 ‘All these down to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius.’ There remain thirteen notices, attached to Nos. 1 [*μέχρι Νέρωνος* only], 7, 11, 15 [*μέχρι ια΄ Ἀντωνί(ν)ου* only], 23, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. I cannot but think that reflection will make it probable to every one that so large a number of notices as this must have been adapted by Epiphanius from some complete chronology. And as a matter of fact if a starting-point be made with Epiphanius' year for the Crucifixion, A.D. 31, and if the chronology of the Anonymus and Eutychius be followed—omitting of course the two bishops Eusebius and Elias, unknown to Epiphanius—the result brings us down to the year A.D. 277, a date twenty years removed from the true date of Hymenaeus' death [c. A.D. 298], but similar to one form of the term given by Epiphanius, the reign of ‘Aurelian’ [A.D. 270–275], and identical with the other form, the reigns of ‘Aurelian and Probus’ [A.D. 270–282][1]. Similarly the death of the next preceding bishop, Mazabanes, is put by the chronology in A.D. 254, and by Epiphanius under Gallus and Volusian [A.D. 251–253], but the true date is c. A.D. 265. The death of Alexander is in the chronology A.D. 233, in Epiphanius ‘under Alexander Severus’ [A.D. 222–235]—apparently towards the end of the reign, since he makes the death of his predecessor Narcissus fall in the same reign—whereas in fact he suffered under Decius, A.D. 250. This remarkable agreement in error in the case of these three bishops, and especially in the case of Alexander, seems to me not likely to be fortuitous. The earlier bishops cannot be tested in the same way, because we do not know their true dates. But if we look only at the names of the reigns in Epiphanius, and omit the years added in some of the earlier cases to the name of the reign, we shall find a similar agreement with the chronographers, except in the single case of the note to No. 15. The proportion of agreement and difference seems to me to be sufficiently marked to warrant the conclusion that

---

[1] According to Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 289) Epiphanius when he said the fourth year of Aurelian (*Haer.* lxvi 1) meant really the fourth year of Probus, which is the date given for Manes in Eusebius' *Chronicle.*

Epiphanius already had before him a complete chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem, nearly resembling that of the Anonymus and Eutychius. That he should make some blunders in applying it, is only what we should expect of Epiphanius.

This result, interesting as it is for the criticism of our authorities, does not help us in our main problem, the criticism of the Jerusalem list itself: for it is certain that the chronology, even though it now appears to be older than Epiphanius, is not older than Eusebius, who found no chronology at Jerusalem; and being grossly erroneous wherever we can test it, it may be dismissed from further consideration.

But there still remains one notice in Epiphanius, to which I promised to recur, the reference to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius. If there was a chronographer of this year, as the evidence of Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius taken together seems to imply, can a name be put to him? Schlatter's conjecture that it was Judas, the last Jewish bishop of Jerusalem, has been completely disposed of by Harnack, who himself suggests Cassianus. The *Exegetica* of Julius Cassianus are quoted by Clement as fixing the date of Moses, in near neighbourhood of his mention of calculations from Moses to David, from David to the second year of Vespasian [i. e. the taking of Jerusalem], and from Vespasian to the tenth year of A. Pius (*Strom.* i 21 101 ; i 21 147). And if Cassianus was the chronographer of this tenth year of Pius (=A.D. 147), and busied himself, as the evidence of Epiphanius suggests, with Jerusalem bishops, is it not natural, it may be asked, to go on to identify him with the Cassianus whom the list names as second gentile bishop of Jerusalem? What we do know, however, of the chronographer Cassianus appears to be fatal to this identification, since Clement of Alexandria speaks of him as a leader of the Docetae, and gives no hint of his having been at any earlier period a Catholic bishop. But even when we have renounced the attempt to find a name, there still remains just a possibility that Epiphanius may be so far right that some chronographer of the year 147 did take some notice of the episcopal succession of Jerusalem.

If this were the case, we should at last have found something of what we set out to seek, an authority older than, and unknown to, Eusebius. Yet it would still be very unlikely that the name-less chronographer really gave a list of all the twenty bishops who precede in Epiphanius' list the notice of the tenth year of Pius: for not only was the church of Aelia then singularly unimportant, but the complete severance of traditions and associations, which must have intervened between the Jewish church of Jerusalem and the gentile church of Aelia Capitolina, would have made it unnatural for a writer of that day to look upon the Jewish bishops as in the same line of succession with the Gentile.

Such is the solitary fragment of testimony that can, under the most favourable circumstances, be thought to offer any external support to the Jerusalem tradition propounded to Eusebius of the list of bishops between Symeon and Narcissus: and seeing how little it amounts to, we are in effect thrown back wholly on internal considerations and evidence of intrinsic probability as our final criterion.

1. I have already said that the feature of the list which arrested the attention of Eusebius, and would of course arrest the attention of the most casual observer, is the abnormally large number of names which it contains. Down to the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian fifteen names are catalogued: and as we know that Symeon, the second bishop, died only under Trajan, that is at earliest c. A.D. 100, only thirty-five years at most are left to be spread over thirteen episcopates. Nor is this feature peculiar to the Jewish portion of the list: it marks the early Gentile episcopates to almost the same extent. From Marcus to Dolichianus are fourteen names, and they have to be compressed into the space between A.D. 135 and A.D. 195, the epoch of the Paschal controversy, when Narcissus was already bishop: nor is there much more room for the succeeding three or four names.

The only explanation of which Eusebius had heard was that the Jewish bishops were κομιδῇ βραχυβίους, 'excessively short-lived.' It cannot be said to be absolutely impossible that twenty-eight bishops should have succeeded one another in the space of a single century, since the Popes of the early middle ages, and especially of the tenth century, followed almost as rapidly. Yet the scholars who have investigated the question in our own day have rightly felt that this solution is unsatisfactory. Harnack characterises it bluntly as false, and sees in the multiplicity of names an argument against episcopacy: these numerous 'bishops' are not lineal successors, but contemporary presbyter-bishops, and Alexander was the first monarchical bishop in the gentile church of Aelia (pp. 129, 221). The explanation might have seemed a specious one, if we had only had to do with the bishops of the Jewish church previous to A.D. 135, for it would be a tenable hypothesis that episcopacy in the later sense was not universal before that time, just as it would be a tenable hypothesis that some limited number of bishops had followed one another from accidental causes in very rapid succession: it is the extension of the phenomenon to the end of the second century which is fatal to either theory. We might possibly believe in thirteen bishops reigning on an average only two and a half years; we cannot believe in twenty-seven bishops reigning on an average only three and a half years. We might possibly admit the existence of presbyter-bishops at Jerusalem: it is impossible to believe that the church of Aelia was still at the beginning of the third century clinging to a polity which, if it ever existed at all, was already becoming antiquated before this gentile church had been founded.

The same obstacle lies in the way of accepting yet a third explanation, that offered by Professor Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 300), who thinks that all fifteen Jewish bishops of the list must have been real bishops, and that as they cannot all, it would seem, have been bishops of Jerusalem, some names from neighbouring sees, such as Caesarea, must have been incorporated in the Jerusalem list. But since this would be possible (if at all) only of the time when the church of Jerusalem was the metropolis and head-quarters of Christianity in Palestine, the explanation must be pronounced quite inapplicable to the second half of the problem, that is, to the gentile bishops of A.D. 135–210; for the church of Aelia was at that time decidedly inferior in importance to the church of Caesarea, and probably also to many other churches in Palestine.

The catalogue of Eusebius contains then, on the face of it, a difficulty, and this difficulty has proved itself incapable of resolution to all the scholars from Eusebius onwards who have dealt with it.

2. I go on to ask whether it is really reasonable to suppose that any one at Jerusalem should have possessed in Eusebius' day a true record of the succession of bishops there from the beginning, and I say confidently that such a supposition is precarious in the extreme. The break in continuity between Jerusalem and Aelia must have been absolute. The christians of Jerusalem must have been, it is natural to think, of the most conservative type of Jewish churchmanship: the christians of Aelia, if at first there were any of them at all, would have been not only gentiles by race, but inimical, by the very fact of their consenting to settle in the pagan city, to all that pertained to Judaism or even to Jewish Christianity[1]. It is scarcely conceivable that they would have looked on themselves as the inheritors and lineal successors of the Jewish community, or would have treasured up the names of the Jewish bishops as the predecessors of their own. And if these names were recorded neither in literature[2], nor in the local tradition of the first generations of gentile christians, it is not easy to see what guarantee of genuineness the informants of Eusebius could have given for this section of the list. The case is no doubt not so strong *a priori* against the gentile names. Yet there would be no known parallel to the preservation down to the fourth century of a complete list of episcopal successions reaching back to the first half of the second. If Eusebius found no such catalogue in his own church of Caesarea—it may be assumed, I think, that he would somewhere have betrayed knowledge of it, had it existed—it would be matter for surprise if the obscure community at Aelia had been more careful in its records. The smaller the church, and the smaller the city to which it belonged, the less likelihood was there of its being fortunate enough to find continuous chroniclers from the start.

It results then, so far, that the preservation of an authentic list was not probable in itself, and that the list actually produced contains an unsolved, perhaps even an insoluble, difficulty. The presumption that this list was unhistorical will be raised to a high degree of probability, if it can be shown that the time and place of its production were such as to offer special and almost irresistible temptation to forgery.

---

[1] Not more than twenty or twenty-five years after the foundation of Aelia Justin Martyr (*Dial.* ch. 47) gives us to understand that some of his fellow churchmen refused the name of christian and the hope of salvation to any who still observed the Jewish law, which presumably the christians of Jerusalem had observed down to its second destruction.

[2] Hegesippus no doubt might have catalogued them, for we know that he was interested in the local 'successions'; but if he had done so, Eusebius would have referred to him as an authority, instead of saying (*Dem. Ev.* iii 5) that the names of these Jewish bishops were still preserved in local tradition.

3. I have spoken of the humble beginnings from which unquestionably the community of gentile christians in Aelia must have grown. Few chapters in the history of the early Church are more curious than the rise of the rulers of this once insignificant body to the fifth place in the precedence of the catholic hierarchy as ratified by the council of Chalcedon: and though it was a far cry to the recognition of the patriarchate, yet the movement by which the church of Aelia began to see in itself the inheritor of the august traditions of the Holy City must have had its roots back in the second century. The impulse perhaps came from outside, as pilgrimages to the Holy Places grew in favour, and pilgrims expressed their veneration for the church which had such memories in its keeping. Melito of Sardis visited the East and 'reached the Place where the Gospel was proclaimed and the Gospel history was acted out[1].' Alexander, according to the local tradition which in this point there is no reason at all to doubt, was visiting Jerusalem from Cappadocia 'for the sake of prayer and investigation of the Places[2],' when he was made coadjutor to Narcissus. Origen, before he wrote his Commentary on St. John, had 'been at the Places for investigation of the footsteps of Jesus and of His disciples and of the prophets[3].' Firmilian of Cappadocian Caesarea interviewed Origen while on a visit to Palestine 'for the purpose of the Holy Places[4].' It would seem that soon after A.D. 200 'the Places' was already a technical term in the language of pilgrimage, though it is clear that it applied to the Holy Land at large, and not to the Holy City only. But one can easily understand how

---

[1] Eus. *H. E.* iv 26 ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη: the verbs have no subject, but are impersonal.

[2] Eus. *H. E.* vi 11 εὐχῆς καὶ τῶν τόπων ἱστορίας ἕνεκεν (the words are Eusebius' own).

[3] *Comm. in Io.* vi 40 (c. A.D. 230–235): he bases his support of the reading 'Bethabara' against 'Bethany' in Jo. i 28 by his personal knowledge, γενόμενοι ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐπὶ ἱστορίαν τῶν ἰχνῶν, &c.

[4] Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 54 sub occasione sanctorum locorum.

the consciousness of living at the centre of things would fill more and more space in the minds of the faithful of Aelia, and how, as the old controversies between Jewish and Gentile christians faded into a forgotten past, a new generation would lay stress on the possession of the sites of the Gospel history, and therewith on the continuity of a tradition which testified to and guarded them. And this continuity would express itself most perfectly in a single line of episcopal succession, such as all the great churches possessed: Jerusalem, if it wished to rival them, ought to possess it too.

At what precise date the feeling that 'Jerusalem ought to possess' developed into the conviction that 'Jerusalem does possess' and the extant list came into being, it is not easy to say. The council of Nicaea in A.D. 325 did not do more than allow the bishop of Aelia precedence in the province next to the metropolitan of Caesarea. But since Eusebius, bishop though he was of the rival see, speaks of 'Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem' as presidents of a Palestinian synod earlier than A.D. 200 (*H. E.* v 23), it is clear that a position of something like equality with Caesarea must have been a *fait accompli* at the beginning of the fourth century: and no doubt local ambitions kept ahead of external recognition. It may well be therefore that the list of bishops was already to hand some years or even decades before Eusebius inquired for it: but if not, we may be sure that the same informants who related the miracles of Narcissus would have been ready also to produce in writing a complete episcopal succession, sooner than confess the absence of it to their neighbour of Caesarea.

Such a forgery of an episcopal catalogue is not, of course, an isolated or unique phenomenon. The pages of the two volumes so far published of the Abbé Duchesne's invaluable *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* offer more than one instructive parallel: compare especially the lists of Geneva Limoges Poitiers and Auch (i 220, ii 47, 77, 92). And the comparison explains to us at once, what we have so far found nothing else to explain, the unusual and unexampled number of names in the list of Jerusalem; for these ecclesiastical forgeries are characterised by no feature more distinctive than the addition of names to the succession of a see with the object of enhancing its antiquity.

Thus at Poitiers eight names are prefixed at the beginning of the list before St. Hilary; at Auch five names are inserted between known bishops of A.D. 511 and 533, and eight names between known bishops of A.D. 551 and 585. At Limoges additional bishops creep in one by one in later redactions, just as we saw Elias and Eusebius appear in later stages of the catalogue of Jerusalem. In all these instances there was a genuine nucleus, just as there was a genuine nucleus at Jerusalem in the names of James and Symeon at the beginning, and of Narcissus, Alexander, and their successors at the end of the list. It is more than possible that occasional names in the interval between Symeon and Narcissus derive from genuine tradition or from scattered notices in writers like Hegesippus. It is even conceivable that whole portions of the list were borrowed from such original authorities as the chronographer of A.D. 147—if he ever existed, and if he said anything about bishops of Jerusalem at all. But on the evidence before us, it is impossible to be satisfied of the substantial genuineness of the list. We must be content to know for certain no more than the names and martyrdoms of the two first bishops, the Lord's brother and the son of Clopas—the substitution of a Gentile for a Jewish line after A.D. 135—the episcopate of Narcissus at the end of the second century, his retirement and return[1] — the coadjutorship, succession and martyrdom of Alexander.

The results of investigation into the fourth of Eusebius' lists are thus, it appears, almost wholly negative. We cannot adduce the succession at Jerusalem as a continuous witness to primitive episcopacy. In another paper I hope, after dealing more briefly with the catalogue of Antioch, to discuss that of Alexandria, and then to approach the core of the problem in the case of the catalogue of Rome.

C. H. TURNER.

---

[1] Not however the names of the three bishops given as ruling during his absence, which are far from being above suspicion.

DOCUMENTS

LATIN LISTS OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS.

1. THE ROMAN COUNCIL UNDER DAMASUS, A.D. 382.

I do not propose to waste time in arguing the question of the genuineness of the council of Damasus which is printed here, not indeed for the first time, but for the first time with a complete critical apparatus of the oldest MSS, and especially of the important Freisingen MS of canons. The genuineness of this *Decretum Damasi* has of course been obscured by the fact that under the later popes Gelasius and Hormisdas it was re-edited and expanded, a list of apocryphal books in particular being added: but it still remains inexplicable that the Damasine matter, which is easily separable, and which is separated not only in the Vatican and Vallicellian MS (my *l* and *vall*), but by Arevalo (A. D. 1794) and by Thiel (A. D. 1866) in their editions, should have been passed over by so many writers without even a mention of its possible authenticity. Thus Bp. Westcott in his *History of the Canon* (ed. 1881, pp. 439, 571) speaks confidently of the Carthaginian list of A. D. 397 as the earliest Conciliar Western list, though that of Damasus —I take the exact date of A. D. 382 on the authority of the Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., who has made a special study of the chronology of the Damasine Councils—precedes it by fifteen years.

The authenticity is however recognized not only by A. Thiel, the indefatigable editor of the *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, but by the greatest modern authority on early Canon Law, Prof. Friedrich Maassen (*Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande* pp. 239, 463), and by the latest writer on the Canon, Prof. Theodor Zahn (*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II i pp. 261–263), though in face of the imperfections of the existing editions he abstained from printing the text. The treatment of the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of St. John betrays the influence of St. Jerome: and we know that Jerome was present at the Council of A. D. 382. To the same source may perhaps be referred the phrase used in describing the Book of Jeremiah—*cum Cinoth id est Lamentationibus suis*—since it recurs word for word in the *Prologus Galeatus* (Vallarsi's Jerome, ix 455).

If any fresh arguments are needed, a comparison of the *Decretum* with the preface to the 'Isidorian' translation of the Nicene canons, the date of which must be some years earlier than A. D. 451, may supply what is wanted. The third part of the Damasine decree, that on the Roman primacy, is borrowed by the 'Isidorian' translator, and forms the groundwork of the first portion of his preface. The matter borrowed comes to an end, as was to be anticipated, with the genuine Damasus, and shows no trace of the expansions to which Gelasius subjected this section of the Damasine decree.

The text that I print is not in all *minutiae* clear from doubt: but I am far from sure that the collation of later MSS would resolve such doubts as remain, and in any case the earliest Latin conciliar list of the books of Scripture deserves to be, pending a final edition, more widely known than it is at present. One point to which attention may be directed is the order of the New Testament books, where, following the MSS *l vall*, I have placed the Acts between the Apocalypse and the Catholic Epistles. Most early authorities put the Acts and Catholic Epistles together: but I do not know of any which place them both after the Apocalypse.

The manuscripts collated for the text are Monacensis lat. 6243 (ꝼ) fol. 1*a* (which I have followed as a rule both in spellings and in readings), Parisinus lat. 3837 (*a*) fol. 169*b*, Vaticanus 5845 (*l*) fol. 194*a*, Vallicellianus A 5 (*vall*) fol. 238 *b*: the abbreviations for these MSS are those employed in my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*. I have to thank my friend Dr. G. Mercati of the Vatican Library for his kind help in collating one of them. Of the four MSS ꝼ (probably) and *l* are of the end of the eighth century, *a* of the early ninth and *vall* of the ninth. The editions which I have consulted are (1) Eusebius Amort *Elementa Iuris Canonici*, vol. I (Ferrara A. D. 1763), part 2, no. lxii; the text is printed from Cod. Monac. 5508, which is either a direct or a near collateral descendant of ꝼ, and the Damasine decree runs on, as in ꝼ, into the Gelasian: (2) Faustinus Arevalo *Caelii Sedulii Opera Omnia* (Rome A. D. 1794), appendix v, p. 400; the text is mainly taken from Vat. 349, a very debased representative of the same family as *vall*, but the notes contain many readings from Vat. 5845 (*l*); Arevalo's one merit is that he was (I believe) the first to distinguish clearly the *Decretum Damasi* from the *Decretum Gelasii*: (3) A. Thiel *De decretali Gelasii papae . . . et Damasi concilio Romano* (Braunsberg A. D. 1166), pp. 20–22; Thiel examined many manuscripts but gives no proper *apparatus criticus*—he did not collate ꝼ, and his readings almost always agree with *a*. As each of the three editions gives a text which is better represented in one or other of my four MSS, I have not thought it worth while to record their readings.

INCIPIT CONCILIVM VRBIS ROMAE SVB DAMASO PAPA DE EXPLANATIONE FIDEI

DICTVM EST

Prius agendum est de spiritu septiformi qui in Christo requiescit. Spiritus sapientiae : *Christus dei uirtus et dei sapientia.* Spiritus intellectus : *Intellectum dabo tibi et instruam te in uia in qua ingredieris.* Spiritus consilii : *Et uocabitur nomen eius magni consilii angelus.* Spiritus uirtutis : ut supra *Dei uirtus et dei sapientia.* Spiritus scientiae : *Propter eminentia*[*m*] *Christi scientiae Iesu* apostoli. Spiritus ueritatis : *Ego uia et uita et ueritas.* Spiritus timoris [dei] : *Initium sapientiae timor domini.*

Multiformis autem nominum Christi dispensatio : Dominus, quia spiritus : Verbum, quia deus : Filius, quia unigenitus ex patre : homo, quia natus ex uirgine : sacerdos, quia se optulit holocaustum : pastor, quia custos : uermis, quia resurrexit : mons, quia fortis : uia, quia rectus per ipsum ingressus in uitam : agnus, quia passus est : lapis angularis, quia instructio : magister, quia ostensor uitae : sol, quia inluminator : uerus, quia a patre : uita, quia creator ; panis, quia caro : Samaritanus, quia custos et misericors : Christus, quia unctus : Iesus, quia saluator : Deus, quia ex deo : angelus, quia missus : sponsus, quia mediator : uitis, quia sanguine ipsius redempti sumus : leo, quia rex : petra, quia firmamentum : fundamentum, quia firmamentum : flos, quia electus : propheta, quia futura reuelauit, Spiritus enim sanctus non est patris tantummodo aut fili tantummodo spiritus, sed patris et fili spiritus ;

5. 1 Cor. i 24   6. Ps. xxxi (xxxii) 8   7. Is. ix 6   8. 1 Cor. i 24
9. Phil. iii 8   10. Jo. xiv 6   Ps. cx (cxi) 10, Prouerb. ix 10

2. fidaei *F*   4. agendum est : + et *a*   6. in qua *F a* : quam *l vall*   7. inuocabitur *l vall*   8. ut supra dei uirtus *F a* : ut supradictum est (*tantum*) *l vall*   9. Propter eminentiam *l vall* : propter eminentia *F a*   scientia *a*   Iesu *F a* : + xpi (*iterum*) *l vall*   10. Ego uia et uita *F* : ego sum uia et uita *a* et ego uita *l vall*   dei : *om l vall*   12. autem : *om F*^{2} dispensatio : + est *l vall*   13. spiritus : christus (xps *pro* sps) *l vall*   deus filius : dei filius *l vall*   ex : a *vall*   15. custus *F a*   uermes *F* uermi *l vall**   rectus per ipsum ingressus *l vall* : rectus quia per ipsum ingressus *F* rectus, ostium quia per ipsum ingressus *a*   16. in uitam *l vall* : in uita est *F a*   est (*post* passus) : *om l*   lapis angularis quia instructio *l vall* : lapis quia instructio angularis *F* lapis quia structio angularis *a*   17. inluminat *F* illuminator *l vall*   19. custus *F a*   20. missus *F a* : nuntius *l vall*   uites *F*   22. fundamentum quia firmamentum *F* l vall* : fundamenti est *F*^{2} ; *om per homoeoteleuton ? a*   23. reuelauit *F a* : reuelat *l vall*   24. filii *l*

scriptum est enim *Si quis dilexerit mundum, non est spiritus patris in illo*, item scriptum est *Quisquis autem spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius*; nominato ita patre et filio intellegitur spiritus sanctus de quo ipse filius in euangelio dicit quia spiritus sanctus *a patre procedit* et *de meo accipiet et adnuntiabit uobis.*

ITEM DICTVM EST

Nunc uero de scripturis diuinis agendum est quid uniuersalis catholica recipiat ecclesia et quid uitare debeat.

Incipit ordo ueteris testamenti :

Genesis	liber unus	
Exodus	liber unus	
Leuiticus	liber unus	
Numeri	liber unus	
Deuteronomium	liber unus	
Iesu Naue	liber unus	
Iudicum	liber unus	
Ruth	liber unus	
Regum	libri quattuor	
Paralypomenon	libri ii	
Psalmi CL	liber i	
Salamonis	libri iii	
prouerbia		liber i
ecclesiastes		liber i
cantica canticorum		liber i
Item sapientia	liber i	
ecclesiasticus	liber i	

25. 1 Jo. ii 15 26. Rom. viii 9 28. Jo. xv 26 Jo. xvi 14

vall patri *a* filii *a l vall* 25. scriptum *in ras* F (si quis, *uide sequentia, ut uid* F*) 26. scribtum F quisquis F *a* : qui *l vall* spiritum : sps *l vall*^{2} xps *vall** 27. ita F *a* : itaque *l vall* intellegi intellegitur *l* sanctus : sci *a* 28. procedet F 29. adnuntiauit F annuntiauit *l* annuntiabit *vall*

2. scribturis F uniuersales F 3. recipit *a* et : uel *a* 6–12. liber unus F *vall*: liber i *a l* 6. exodi *a* 7. leuiticum *a* 8. numeri F *a* : numerus *l vall* 9. deuteronomii F 10. iesu nabe *l* 13. quattuor F *l*: iiii *a vall* 14. paralypomenon F *vall*^{2} : paralippomenon *a* paralipomenon *l vall** 15. psalmi CL F : psalmorum CL *a* psalterium *l vall* 16. salomoni *a* salomonis *l vall* 17. prouerbia liber i F : prouerbium (proberb. *l*) liber i *l vall*: *om a* 18. ecclesiastes liber i : *om per homoeoteleuton l* 20. sapientia *l vall*: sapientiae F *a* 21. ecclesiasticus *l vall* ecclesiasticum *a* ecclesiastes (*iterum*) F

Item ordo prophetarum
Esaiae liber unus
Hieremiae liber unus
cum Cinoth id est lamentationibus suis
Ezechiel liber i
Danihel liber i
Oseae liber i
Amos liber i
Micheae liber i
Iohel liber i
Abdiae liber i
Ionae liber i
Naum liber i
Ambacum liber i
Sophoniae liber i
Aggei liber i
Zachariae liber i
Malacihel liber i
Item ordo storiarum
Iob liber i
Tobiae liber i
Esdrae libri ii
Hester liber i
Iudit liber i
Machabeorum libri duo
Item ordo scripturarum noui et aeterni testamenti quem sancta et catholica suscipit ecclesia:
Euangeliorum
secundum Matheum liber i

---

22. item: incipit *l vall* 23. liber unus F *l*: liber i *a vall* 24. liber unus F: liber i *a l vall* 25. chinoth *a* id est F *a*: + cum *l vall* 26. ezechiel F: ezechielis *a* hiezechihel *l vall* 27. daniheli *a* 30. michae *vall* 33. ione *l* 35. ambacum F: abbacuc *a l vall* 36. suffoniae *a* 39. malacihel F: malachiae *l vall* malachi *a* liber i *a vall*: liber unus *l*; *om* F 40. historiarum *a l vall* 41. liber unus *l* 43–45. *tr* iudith liber i hester liber i hesdrae liber (lib l^2) ii *l* iudit lib i hester lib i hesdrae lib ii *vall* 43. libri ii F^2 (*vall*): lib i *a* (l^* ?); *om* F^* (*corr m p*) 45. iudith *a l* 46. duo F *l*: ii *a vall*

47. scribturarum F et aeterni F: et ueteris *a*; *om l vall* sancta et (*om* et *l*) catholica suscipit ecclesia F *l vall*: sancta et catholica romana suscipit et ueneratur ecclesia id est *a* 49. euangeliorum:

secundum Marcum	liber unus
secundum Lucam	liber unus
secundum Iohannem	liber unus
Epistulae Pauli [apostoli] numero xiiii	
ad Romanos	una
ad Corinthios	duas
ad Ephesios	i
ad Thesalonicenses	ii
ad Galatas	i
ad Philippenses	i
ad Colosenses	i
ad Timotheum	ii
ad Titum	i
ad Filimonem	i
ad Hebreos	i
Item apocalypsis Iohannis	liber i
Et actus apostolorum	liber i
Item epistulae canonicae numero vii	
Petri apostoli	epistulae duas
Iacobi apostoli	epistula una
Iohannis apostoli	epistula una
alterius Iohannis presbyteri	epistulae duae
Iudae zelotis apostoli	epistula i
Explicit canon noui testamenti	

+libri iiii *a* 50. mattheum F 51–53. liber unus F: liber i *a l* (*sed* 53 unus *l*) *vall* 52. lucan *l* 54. Epistulae Pauli: *praem* actuum apostolorum liber unus F item actum apostolorum lib i *a sed uide l* 67 apostoli: *om l vall* quattuordecim *vall* 55–65. ad Romanos *etc*: +epistola (epistolae) *a* 55. una F *l*: i *a vall* 56. duas F, *cf infra l* 69 *et Canonem muratorianum* ad tymotheum duas, iohannis duas *uide Th. Zahn* Geschichte des ntl. Kanons II i 76 (*adde indices librorum Laodicenum interprete Isidoro* Petri duas *et Carthaginiensem anni* 419 Petri apostoli duas, *secundum codices utriusque meliores*): duo *l* ii *a vall* 58. thessalonicenses *a* 59. galathas *a l* 60. phylipenses *vall* 61. cholosenses a^* 63. i: prima *l* 64. filimonem F: philimonem *a l vall* i: ii *l vall* 65. ebreos *a* 66. apochalipsis *a* iohannis F *a*: + apostoli *l vall* 67. et actus apostolorum liber i *l vall*: *om* F *a* (*uide ad l* 54 *supra*) 68. epistul̄ canoñ F: *tr* canonicae epistulae *a* 69. duas F^* *uide* 57 *supra*: duae F^2 ii *a l vall* 70, 71. una F: i *a l vall* 72. prbi F pbri *l vall* duae F: ii *a l vall* 73. iude *a* zelotes F apostoli F *a*: *om l vall* 74. explicit canon noui testamenti F *a l*: + numero uii (*uide l* 68 *supra*) *vall*

ITEM DICTVM EST

Post has omnes propheticas et euangelicas adque apostolicas quas superius deprompsimus scripturas, quibus ecclesia catholica per gratiam Dei fundata est, etiam illud intimandum putauimus quod quamuis uniuersae per orbem catholicae diffusae ecclesiae unus thalamus Christi sit, sancta tamen Romana ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis ceteris ecclesiis praelata est sed euangelica uoce domini et saluatoris nostri primatum obtenuit: *Tu es Petrus* inquiens *et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam et portae inferi non praeualebunt aduersus eam, et tibi dabo claues regni caelorum et quaecumque ligaueris super terram erunt ligata et in caelo et quaecumque solueris super terram erunt soluta et in caelo.* addita est etiam societas beatissimi Pauli apostoli uas electionis, qui non diuerso sicut heresei garriunt sed uno tempore uno eodemque die gloriosa morte cum Petro in urbe Roma sub Caesare Nerone agonizans coronatus est, et pariter supradictam sanctam Romanam ecclesiam Christo domino consecrarunt aliisque omnibus urbibus in uniuerso mundo sua praesentia adque uenerando triumpho praetulerunt. est ergo prima Petri apostoli sedis Romanae ecclesiae *non habens maculam nec rugam nec aliquid eiusmodi.* secunda autem sedis apud Alexandriam beati Petri nomine a Marco eius discipulo atque euangelista consecrata est, ipseque in Aegypto directus a Petro apostolo uerbum ueritatis praedicauit et gloriosum consummauit martyrium. tertia uero sedis apud Anthiociam beatissimi apostoli Petri habetur honorabilis, eo quod illic primus quam Romae uenisset habitauit et illic primum nomen christianorum nouelle gentis exortum est.

3. deprumpsimus *F* depromsimus *a*   scribturas *F*   4. dei: *om l*   illud: illum *a** ; *om l vall*   quamuis: + in *l vall*   5. uniuerse *a*   orbe (*om* per) *l*   diffuse *F a*   aecclesiae *F*   unus: *praem* quasi *l vall*   6. sit: sed *F*   romanae ecclesiae *F*   nullis: nonnullis *l** *vall* non ullis l^2 sinodicis *a*   caeteris *l*   7. sed: + et *vall*   et: *om l vall*   8. primatum *F l vall*: principatum *a*   optinuit *l vall*   9. inferi: inferni *a*   10. clabes *l*   legaueris *F*   11. ligata et: legata et *F* ligatae *a*   super terra *F*   soluta et: solute *a*   12. *societas in ras F* (bea *F** *ut uid*: *corr m p*)   uas *F*: uasis *a l vall*   13. heresei *F a*: heretici *l vall*   *tempore F in ras* (eodemq ; *F** : *corr m p*)   14. diae *F*   15. neronae *F a*   16. urbibus: *om l vall*   17. atque *l vall*   uenerando: narrando *a*   18. sedes *l vall*   romanae ecclesiae *F l vall** : romana ecclesia *vall*^{2} *a*   19. eiusmodi *F a*: ẹịhuiusmodi *l* huiusmodi *vall*   sedes *l vall*   21. in aegypto *F a*: in aegyptum *l vall*   23. sedes est *l vall*   apud: *om a*   anthiocia *F* antiochiam *a l vall*   24. illic: illam *l vall*   primus quam *F*: primitus quam *l vall* priusquam *a*   romae *F a*: romam *l vall*   25. gentes? *F**

C. H. TURNER.

NOTES

ON ΠΛΗΡΗΣ IN ST. JOHN i 14.

(*See* J. T. S., *Oct.* 1899, *pp.* 120–125.)

Communications have been kindly made to me since the publication of the above note, by Dr. Nestle and Mr. Burkitt respectively: both writers support the main contention of the note, while offering corrections, of which I gladly avail myself, in points of detail.

I had overlooked the fact that in the *Corrigenda and Addenda* to Blass, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (p. xii), is printed the following short note from Dr. Nestle in supplement to the passage which I quoted (J. T. S., p. 121) from the text of the Grammar: 'Πλήρης indeklin. auch LXX, z. Bsp. Num. vii 13 F, vii 19 ℵ, vii 20 ℵ* B, Hiob xxi 24 alle, Sir. xix. 23 B*. Vgl. "eine Arbeit voller Fehler."' In the result one small correction (B* for B in Ecclus. xix. 26 [23]) must be made in my statement of the LXX evidence, while a very interesting and striking parallel to the indeclinable use of the Greek πλήρης is supplied from the indeclinable use of the German *voller*. He adds the expression of his own belief that Luther, when he wrote in Jo. i 14 *voller Gnade und Wahrheit*, meant to make *voller* depend on *Herrlichkeit*.

Dr. Nestle also quotes Origen *contra Celsum* vi 77 λεξόντων τό· Εἴδομεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, οὐκέτι δὲ προσθησόντων· Δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. The passage confirms the view that Origen took πλήρης with some other noun than λόγος, and considered by itself would favour the connexion with δόξαν, thus bringing Origen into line with the other Greek Fathers.

Further, M. Bonnet writes to Dr. Nestle to call attention firstly to three passages in the *Acta Thomae* (ed. Bonnet, A. D. 1883: pp. 11. 27, 62. 2, 91. 5) where one or other of the MSS gives πλήρης for the accusative singular, and secondly to a paper by Brinkmann in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1899 (liv p. 94), in the course of which a dozen instances of πλήρης indeclinable are adduced. They include (besides some already given in J. T. S., p. 122) four from papyri—*Berliner Aegypt. Urkund.* 411. 12 [A. D. 314] and 371. 20 [late date]; Grenfell and Hunt, *Greek*

Papyri, ii 69. 29 [A. D. 265] and 75. 8 [A. D. 305]—and two more from pseudonymous literature, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (in Texts and Studies, v 1), 93. 29, and *Apocalypse of Paul*, ed. Tischendorf, 51. 1. [I can now add myself Athanasius *Tom. ad Antiochenos* 4 ἀλλὰ πλήρη εὐσεβείας εἶναι, where the Benedictines note that two MSS—including their best, the *Regius*—read πλήρης.]

In speaking of the Syriac versions (p. 123, ll. 14, 15) I fell into error in under-estimating the support they give to my view. My friend Mr. F. C. Burkitt tells me that (1) in the Curetonian the (masculine) gender of the word 'full' shews that it must go not with 'word' which is feminine, but with either 'glory' or 'only-begotten' which are both masculine: (2) in the Peshitto the sometimes ancient punctuation retained in the New York edition divides the verse into three clauses: (i) καὶ ὁ λόγος . . . ἐν ἡμῖν, (ii) καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, (iii) δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, so that 'full' is separated from 'The Word,' but goes equally well with 'glory' or 'only-begotten,' or indeed even with 'Father': (3) in the Palestinian Syriac 'glory' is feminine as well as 'word,' so that the masculine 'full' must be taken with μονογενοῦς or πατρός.

My most grateful thanks are due to both Dr. Nestle and Mr. Burkitt for supplying me with these opportunities of confirming my argument.

C. H. TURNER.

NOTE ON THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS CONTAINING, OR RELATING TO, THE PROPOSALS OF THE NONJURING BISHOPS FOR A 'CONCORDATE' WITH THE HOLY ORTHODOX CHURCH OF THE EAST (1716–1725).

MR. LATHBURY was, if I mistake not, the first writer during the present century to give a tolerably full account of the negotiations between certain of the nonjuring bishops and the Russian and Greek Churches, extending, at intervals, from 1716 to 1725. In his *History of the Nonjurors*, 1845 (pp. 309–358), he printed, from a MS in the collection made by Bishop Jolly, a large body of letters and papers which, in their English form, had been transcribed and arranged by Dr. Thomas Brett, who had been consecrated a bishop among the nonjurors in 1716. In 1868 Mr. George Williams published his volume, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the eighteenth century, being the correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops.* With his scholarly instincts he naturally made search for the original documents. There was a hint that they might be in the Library at Lambeth, but on enquiry this hope turned out to be unfounded. He discovered, however, that 'copies of the most important papers in Greek are contained in a small 4to volume among the Wake Papers in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford'; 'but,' he adds, 'the bulk of the Correspondence and the Original Letters of the Patriarchs have as yet baffled my search' (p. lxvii). Now it is curious to find that one of the copies of Brett's 'Account' which Williams collated (apparently the same as that used by Lathbury) was lent to him from Bishop's Jolly's library, then deposited at Trinity College, Glenalmond, and that by a piece of remarkable ill-luck Williams was not supplied with the originals which he sought and which all the while were lying probably on the very same shelf with Brett's 'Account.' These interesting and valuable documents were some years ago transferred to the Theological College of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, at Edinburgh. It may be of use to students to have these documents catalogued.

We have no express evidence as to how the documents came into Bishop Jolly's collection; but as the original suggestion that a 'Concordate' should be attempted came from the Scottish bishop, Archibald Campbele, and as he and his fellow-countryman, Bishop James Gadderar, took an active part in the negotiations, one may conjecture that it was through one or other of these that the documents reached Scotland. But as to how or where they were preserved before coming into the hands of Bishop Jolly I am unable to say[1].

The documents are contained in three folio volumes, bound in brown calf, and consist of (1) the original 'fair copies' (transcribed in a clear clerkly hand) of the letters, &c., sent by the nonjurors to Russia and the East, together with (2) the actual letters and other official documents sent in reply. These latter are all neatly inserted (sometimes mounted on guards), and are in perfect preservation. These three volumes I will designate respectively as A, B, C.

There is a fourth folio volume (in limp parchment), which I will mark D. But it is only a copy of Brett's 'Account,' that is, a transcript of the English drafts of the correspondence on the side of the nonjurors[2], and of translations into English of the Latin, Greek, and Muscovite letters and documents on the side of the Russians and Greeks, all arranged chronologically, together with some observations by Brett himself. In the following note it has been found seldom necessary to refer to D. Its contents have been printed in Mr. George Williams' volume referred to above, and as this is a book which every one who is interested in the subject must have in his hands, it may be useful to note the pages in Williams' book (which I designate as W) at which the documents referred to in the catalogue may be found.

---

[1] There is some reason, I think, to suppose that they were once in the possession of William Falconer, bishop, successively, of Caithness, Moray, and Edinburgh, and Primus (1762-82); but the question need not be pursued here.

[2] As the English drafts were not subscribed, Brett has added the subscriptions from the Latin and Greek of the letters as actually sent.

There is inserted in the front of A a catalogue of all the letters and documents in a hand which I have not identified[1]. It is evidently written by one who had some knowledge of the inner history of the proceedings, and contains some valuable information as to the persons who drew up the documents on the side of the nonjurors, and as to those who were employed to do the work of translation into and from the Greek and Latin.

I have thought it best to transcribe this old catalogue, placing anything added by me in square brackets.

'An Acct of the Papers relating to a Concordate between the Greek Church and the Catholick remnant of the British Churches.'

1. A Proposal for a Concordate, Gr. [A 1] Lat. [A 9] and English [A 19: W 4], dated August 18, 1716. The English, I suppose, was drawn up by Mr. Collier or Dr. Lee; the Latin by Dr. Lee, and the Greek by Mr. Spinckes. It was sent into the East to Muscovy, subscribed by Mr. Collier, and Mr. Campbel, and Mr. Gadderar; and concocted at Mr. Hawes's.

[On a loose folio sheet lying in the same volume (A) containing a transcript of the catalogue there is added in a contemporary hand, 'N.B. The English of this 1st Proposal was not sent, but only the Gr. to the Patriarchs, and the Latin was given to the Abp. of Thebes [*sic*], that he might, if he had an opportunity, communicate it to the Moscovites, when he was there. And both the Lat. and Gr. were subscribed by the same Bps.']

2. A Letter to the Czar of Moscovy, Lat. [B 2] and Eng. [B 1: W 12], dat. Oct. 8, 1717, drawn up, I believe, in both languages by Mr. Collier, and subscribed by Mr. Collier, Mr. Campbel, and Mr. Gadderar.

3. A Letter from the Abp. of Thebais in Greek, dat. from Petersburg, Aug. 16, 1721 [B 5], with a Translation by Tho. Wagstaffe [B 7: W 12][2].

4. The Patriarchs' Answer to the proposal, in Greek [A 31–82], dat.

---

[1] Quaere, T. Deacon's?

[2] The words 'The *second Decade* of the month **Μεταγειτνιών**,' which will be found in W and in D, are not in Wagstaffe's translation. Arsenius seems to have first written *ἱσταμένου*, and then, seeing his mistake, to have corrected it into *μεσοῦντος*, but the word is not very legible. As I read the words they are *μεταγειτνιῶνος ιϛʹ μεσοῦντος*.

April 12, 1718, but not brought hither till about 1722; subscribed by Samuel, the then Patriach of Alexandria, and his Patriarchal Seal impressed at the bottom, with a Translation by T. Wagstaffe [A 85–145: W 15[1]].

5. Reply to the Patriarchs' Answer to the Proposal, dat. May 29, 1722, drawn up in English by Mr. Collier [A 181–201: W 83], but sent only in Greek and Latin; of which the Greek [A 149–162] was done by T. Wagstaffe, and the Latin [A 163–180] by Mr. Jebb; subscribed by Mr. Collier, Dr. Brett, Mr. Campbel, and Mr. Gatherer, and Thomas Deacon, the registrar. [Gatherer is a not infrequent variant of Gadderar in the nonjuring writings of the time. Collier subscribed the Greek version as *ὁ Ἀγγλο-βρεταννίας πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱερεμίας.* The *πρῶτος*, when it came to the knowledge of Archbishop Wake, naturally gave offence. T. Deacon, too, subscribes in rather grandiloquent language, *ὁ μέγας χαρτοφύλαξ Θωμᾶς ὁ τοῦ Διακόνου.*]

6. Communion Office in Gr. [A 203] and Lat. [A 227], of which the Greek was done by Mr. Griffin, and the Latin by Mr. Ford. [These documents show at a glance that Mr. Williams (p. 102) is in error in stating that the Communion Office referred to was 'the Scottish Communion Office.' They are translations of the English Nonjurors' Communion Office, as it appears in the volume *A Communion Office, taken partly from the Primitive Liturgies, and partly from the first English Reformed Common Prayer Book, together with Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick: London*, 1718. This has been reprinted in P. Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. v (1848), and in Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office* (1884). Mr. Williams' error is however partially condoned by the fact that he did not find the office in any of the copies of Brett's Account which he had collated. It is interesting to note that in the document sent to the East the nonjuring bishops gave the words of the Creed, referring to the Double Procession as follows: *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς [καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ] ἐκπορευόμενον*; and added the marginal note *Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα [καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ] παραλειφθήσονται ὅταν ἡ ἕνωσις τῆς κοινωνίας χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ εὐδαιμόνως συντελεθήσεται.*]

7. Letter to the Abp. of Thebais, dat. May 30, 1722, drawn up in Eng. [B 9: W 102] by Mr. Campbel, but sent, as I remember, only in Latin [B 11], which was done by Mr. Jebb; subscribed by Mr. Collier, Dr. Brett, Mr. Campbel, and Mr. Gaderar.

8. Letter to the Ecclesiastical Council at Petersburg, dat. May 30, 1722, Eng. [B 13: W 104] and Lat. [B 15], viz. Eng. by Mr. Collier and Lat. by Mr. Jebb, subscribed by the same as the former, and sent, I think, in both languages, but *quaere*. [The Latin has appended the

---

[1] This is throughout written in beautiful clerkly Greek script, save the autograph attestation and subscription.

following, not reproduced in Brett's 'Account' or in W, 'Serenissimo Imperatori Magnae Russiae, et Sacro Concilio Praesidentibus, Reverendissimis Archiepiscopis ac Dominis D. Stephano Razamiensi, D. Theodosio Novogradensi, D. Theophani Piscoviensi.']

9. Letter to the Count de Golowkin, Lord High Chancellor of Russia, Eng. dat. May 31, 1722; drawn up by Mr. Collier, and subscribed by him, Mr. Campbel, and Mr. Gaderar. [B 17 : W 106. A marginal note in the old catalogue observes of 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 'these were all sent at the same time.']

10. Letter from the Abp. of Thebais in Greek [B 19], dat. June 11, 1722, with a Translation [B 21 : W 107] by T. Wagstaffe.

11. Letter in Eng. from the Protosyncellus, dat. Petersburg, Sept. 20, 1722 [B 23 : W 107].

12. Letter from the Abp. of Thebais in Lat., dat. at Moscow, Dec. 9, 1722 [B 27 : W 108. The English translation given by W is not among the originals].

13. Answer to the Abp. of Thebais in Lat., dat. January 28, 172⅔, subscribed by Mr. Collier and Mr. Campbel [B 31. The English [W 110] is not among the originals].

14. A Letter from the Abp. of Thebais in Lat., dat. from Moscow, Aug. 25, 1723 [B 33. The English translation [W 112] is not among the originals, but is taken, as in the last instance, from Brett's 'Account.']

15. Letter from the Russian Synod, Moscovitick [B 37] and Latin [B 41], dat. from Moscow, Feb. 1723: subscribed by Theodosius, Archiepiscopus Novo-Gardiae et Archimandrita Alexandro-Nevensis, Theophanes [in the Latin original 'Theophanus'] Archiepiscopus Plescoviensis, Gabriel Archimandrita Sanctae Trinitatis, Sergii Monasterii, Theophylactus Archimandrita Czudoviensis, Ierotheos Archimandrita Noevospaski, Petrus Archimandrita Simonoviensis, Athanasius Igumenus Tolski, Anastasius Nausius. [W 114 is from Brett's 'Account.']

16. Letter from the Russian Synod, Moscovitick [B 45] and Latin [B 49], dat. from Petersburg, Feb. 2, 1724, subscribed by Theophanes Archiepiscopus Plescoviensis, Theophylactus Episcopus Tweriensis, Gabriel Archimandrita SS^{ae} Trinitatis, Theophilus Archimandrita Czudoviensis, Ierotheus Archimandrita S. Salvatoris, Petrus Proto-Presbyter Ecclesiae S. Petri. [W 116 is from Brett's 'Account.']

17. The Patriarchs' Rejoinder to the Reply, in Greek [this important document is bound separately in C], dat. from Constantinople, Sept. 1723, subscribed by Ieremias Patriarch of Constantinople, Athanasius Patriarch of Antioch, Chrysanthus Patriarch of Jerusalem, Callinicus of Heraclea, Auxentius of Cyzicum, Païsius of Nicomedia, Gerasimus of

Nice, Parthenius of Chalcedon, Ignatius of Thessalonica, Arsenius of Prysa, Theoctistus of Philopopolis, Callinicus of Varna: with a translation [C, at the end] by T. Wagstaffe, of as much of it as is not to be found between page 225 and 333 of the Synodus Bethlehemitica, published in Greek and Latin at Paris An. 1676. [Williams has in an Appendix (pp. 141–168) translated the parts omitted by Wagstaffe; but it should be observed that the passage (p. 168) referring, in contemptuous language, to 'Claud, a minister of Charenton,' is not found in the Greek of the Patriarchs' Rejoinder. A marginal note in the old catalogue states that 14, 15, 16, 17, were 'all brought hither at the same time.']

18. Mr. Cassano's Letter [B 53] to the English Bishops for a character [W 122], and their Letter to the Archimandrite upon that subject in Greek, subscribed by Mr. Collier and Mr. Campbel [B 55. Brett's translation in W 123].

19. Answer to the Abp. of Thebais, dat. July 13, 1724, drawn up in English [B 57: W 123], I think, by Dr. Brett, but sent only in Latin [B 59], which was done by Mr. Jebb, subscribed by Mr. Collier, Dr. Brett, Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Campbel.

20. Answer to the Russian Synod, dat. July 13, 1724, Eng. and Lat., of which the Eng. [B 61: W 125] was drawn up by Mr. Collier, and the Latin [B 63] by Mr. Jebb, subscribed by the same as the former, and sent in both languages in one cover.

21. Letter to the Great Chancellor of Russia, English [B 65: W 126], dat. July 13, 1724, drawn up by Mr. Collier, and subscribed by the same as the two former. [A marginal note states that 19, 20, 21 'were all sent at the same time.']

22. The Receipt given to the Protosyncellus (for the books sent to the English Bishops as a present from the Patriarchs), Latin, dat. July 13, 1724, drawn up and subscribed by the same as the three former letters [B 67. The English translation [W 128] is from Brett's 'Account'].

23. A minute delivered to Mr. Cassano, in English, March 8, 1724, i.e. 172$\frac{4}{5}$. [B 68: W 129.]

24. Letter to the Russian Synod, drawn up in English [B 69: W 129] by Mr. Campbel, as I remember, but sent only in Latin [B 70], which was done by Mr. Jebb, dat. April 11, 1725, and subscribed by Mr. Collier, Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Campbel.

25. Letter to the Great Chancellour of Russia, Eng., dat. April 11, 1725, drawn up by [a blank space is left here], and subscribed by the same as the former. [B 71: W 130.]

26. Letter to the Abp. of Thebais, dat. April 11, 1725, drawn up in English [B 72: W 130] by [a blank here], but sent only in Latin

[B 72], which was done by Mr. Jebb, subscribed as the two former. [In the margin 'These (24, 25, 26) were sent at the same time.']

27. The Great Chancellour of Russia's Answer, in English, dat. Sept. 16, 1725 [B 73 : W 131].

This concludes the old catalogue. Some day it may be thought of sufficient interest to print the originals; but it must be acknowledged that the English of Brett's 'Account,' as printed by Williams, gives in all material points the sense of the documents. The important point to notice is that the Greek bishops of that day adopt absolutely the doctrinal definitions of the Synod of Bethlehem, and peremptorily demand of the British bishops acceptance of these doctrinal definitions as the first step towards union.

John Dowden.

1. ON ISAIAH xix 18.

According to the ordinary text we read in Isaiah xix 18—

'In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called The city of destruction.'

So R.V., which adds to the word 'destruction' the marginal note 'Or, *Heres* Or, according to another reading, *the sun*.'

It is obvious that there is a difficulty here. 'City of Destruction' is not a cheering title, and 'City of Heres' is unmeaning, while 'City of the Sun' betrays itself as a mere conjecture, though it is as old as Symmachus and the Targum. 'City of the Sun' would mean Beth-shemesh, i. e. Heliopolis, and Isaiah would hardly have announced in the name of Jahwe that a certain Egyptian city after its conversion would continue to bear an idolatrous name; moreover, the word used is a poetical term for the sun, quite out of place in this passage, as the English reader will feel if he substitutes *Phoebus' Town* for *City of Destruction*.

Most texts of LXX have

πόλις ἀσεδὲκ κληθήσεται ἡ μία πόλις.

It is usually said in commentaries that LXX reads עיר הצדק (i. e. 'City of Righteousness') for עיר ההרס, but this is a very violent change. The object of this Note is to suggest a slight alteration in the Greek, partly attested by existing documentary evidence, which leads to a satisfactory emendation of the Hebrew. I wish to read αεσεδ (or αεσδ) for υσεδεκ, corresponding to עיר החסד. Thereby instead of 'City of

Destruction' we get *City of Mercy*, or more accurately, *City of Kindliness*.

The first hand of ℵ wrote

ΠΟΛΙϹΑϹΕΔΗΛΙΟΥΚΑΙΚΛΗΘΗϹΕΤΑΙΗΜΙΑΠΟΛΙϹ

Here ἡλίου has been imported from Symmachus, and instead of ΕΚ we have ΚΑΙ, evidently an expansion of Ϗ. Now of all the corruptions in the LXX none is commoner than the misreading of transliterations, and I venture to suggest that the κ at the end of ασεδ[ε]κ is intrusive, derived from the initial κ of κληθήσεται written twice over. Thus for instance in 4 Reg. xxiii 36 מן רומה is rendered ΕΚΚΡΟΥΜΑ in B instead of ἐκ Ῥυμά. Similarly in Micah vii 20 δώσει εἰς αλήθειαν (A B Q) is a mere mistake for δώσεις ἀλήθειαν (lat. vt. and Lucian).

The process of corruption thus suggested is that an original ΠΟΛΙϹΑΕϹΕΔΚΛΗΘΗϹΕΤΑΙ became ΠΟΛΙϹΑΕϹΕΔϏΚΛΗΘΗϹΕΤΑΙ, which was then read either πόλις ασεδεκ κληθήσεται (as in the ordinary texts), or πόλις ασεδ καὶ κληθήσεται (as in the ancestor of ℵ). No Old Latin text of any value is here extant.

As to the meaning, *Civitas Pietatis* is exactly the name which is wanted. In Hebrew *hésed* is 'kindliness,' the virtue that knits society together, as Robertson Smith has said. In Hosea vi 6 it is co-ordinated with the true knowledge of the God of Israel, as opposed to sacrifice and burnt-offerings. According to Isaiah xvi 5 the Davidic kingdom is established in this 'kindliness': here, where it is prophesied that Egypt also shall be Jahwe's people, it is eminently appropriate that one of the Egyptian cities should acquire a name which so pointedly describes the new covenant of 'mercy' upon which they were about to enter.

2. ON S. EPHRAIM'S QUOTATION OF MATT. xxi 3.

In preparing the Prolegomena to my forthcoming edition of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* I have had occasion to go over the Gospel quotations of S. Ephraim. In doing so I have come across a point so illuminating that it seems to me worth separate publication.

The most useful collection of S. Ephraim's quotations is still that drawn up by Dr. Woods for his article on the subject in *Studia Biblica* iii, pp. 120–138. It is true that this table does not include the works given in Dr. Lamy's volumes or those published at Oxford in 1865 by Overbeck. Still it has that greatest merit of scholarly work—it can be used and supplemented with ease even by those who do not adopt the conclusions of the author.

The point to which I wish to draw attention concerns the allusion to our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. It occurs in the unabridged Commentary on Genesis, an undoubtedly genuine work of S. Ephraim (Roman edition, vol. iv, pp. 108, 109), and is assigned by Dr. Woods to Mc. xi 2, 3[1]. He calls the quotation a combination of Mark and Matt., and notes that while *C* (the Curetonian) has many verbal variations from the Peshitta, yet in the only important variation it differs from Ephraim's quotation where the quotation agrees with the Peshitta.

The 'important variation' concerns the words which in the Greek of Matt. xxi 3 run

ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει

(Mc. xi 3 and Lc. xix 34 have of course αὐτοῦ in the singular). Adding the evidence of *S* (the Sinai Palimpsest) the extant Syriac readings are :—

1. 'For our Lord they are (*or* it is) required.'	Pesh. (Matt.) (Mc., Lc.).
2. 'For their Lord they are required.'	*C* (Matt.).
3. 'For its Lord it is required.'	*S C* (Lc.), *S* (Mc., *sic*)[2].

It is evident that we have here two independent interpretations of the Greek. According to the Peshitta ὁ κύριος is used absolutely of Christ (as so often in Lc., so rarely in Matt. and Mc.): according to *S* and *C*, on the other hand, αὐτῶν or αὐτοῦ is taken with κύριος, so that it means the 'master' of the animals.

Now the text of S. Ephraim's quotation which Dr. Woods had before him runs thus :—

ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ [ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܝܠܐ ܕܐܣܝܪ. ܫܪܘ ܐܝܬܐܘܗܝ.] ܘܐܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ
ܠܟܘܢ ܡܢܐ ܫܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܝܠܐ ܗܘ. ܐܡܪܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܡܪܢ ܡܬܒܥܐ.

'For He said [Ye will find a colt tied; loose and bring him.] For if they say to you "Why are ye loosing that colt?" say to them that for our Lord it is required.'

The brackets are my own insertion.

It is well known that this Roman edition, brought out in 1732–4, is excessively uncritical, but until I read the tract published upon it in 1862–4 by Dr. A. Pohlmann I did not know what traps are laid in it for the unwary, and I am sure that Dr. Woods was equally unsuspicious. Dr. Pohlmann examined the MS on which the edition was based in this as well as many other places. The practical result of his investigations is that you can never trust a Biblical quotation where it agrees with the Peshitta. In the present instance the bracketed passage is not in the

---

[1] Vols. iv–vi in Dr. Woods's notation are the three Syriac volumes of the Roman edition.

[2] In Mc. xi 3 *S* reads ܕܠܡܪܗ, as is clear from a photograph belonging to Mrs. Lewis, which I have had an opportunity of inspecting, not ܠܡܪܝܐ as edited.

MS at all; it was simply added *de suo* by the editor (Pohlmann, p. 52), while for the last two words the MS actually has (Pohlmann, p. 54)

ܕܠܡܪܗܘܢ ܡܬܒܥܝܢ

in exact accordance with the Curetonian of Matt. xxi 3! The translation therefore of S. Ephraim's reference should run

'For He said that if they say to you "Why are ye loosing that colt?" say to them that for their Lord they are required.'

So disappears one of the most notable agreements of S. Ephraim with the Syriac Vulgate against the 'Old Syriac.' I confess that I am unconvinced that what we call the N. T. Peshitta was in existence in S. Ephraim's day, and I believe that we owe both its production and its victorious reception to the organizing energy of the great Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 411–435 A.D.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE WISDOM OF BEN SIRA.

OF the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus more than half is now extant in fragments of four manuscripts, which we shall call A, B, C, D.

A.

Two pairs of leaves of the MS A were edited in the volume entitled *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Camb. 1899), which was reviewed in the first number of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Two fresh leaves of A, belonging to and edited by Mr. Elkan Nathan Adler, have now been published in No. 47 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (April, 1900), with a preface beginning thus:

'Among the numerous fragments from the Cairo Genizah which I brought away with me in January, 1896, and which I have since acquired, I have discovered a portion of the famous Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus, and hasten to publish the text and translation with facsimiles. The requisite critical appendix and notes must follow, but the case containing the fragment was only opened on March 7 last, and the precious fragment itself identified two days later. This consists of a pair of leaves from the same MS as Messrs. Taylor and Schechter's MS A, and supplies the hiatus in their edition. One other leaf of this same MS has been quite recently discovered by M. Israël Lévi in Paris, containing chapter xxxvi 24 to xxxviii 1, and affording a valuable means of comparison of the two MSS A and B.'

The said Paris fragment being certainly, as Mr. Adler now sees, part of a different MS D, the leaves which we have of A contain only chapters iii–xvi, except some verses, and have nothing in common with the now extant leaves of B.

Mr. Adler's fragment 'in all respects tallies' with the copy described by Saadyah in *Sefer ha-Galuy*. 'It has [some] vowel-points and accents, and one verse (xi 28) corresponds, but for a single letter, with a quotation in that book. . . . Moreover in viii 2 the Massoretic character of the text is strengthened by the appearance of a marginal *Keri* (לו) for the *Kethib* (לא),' or more exactly of לוֹ pointed, at the beginning of the line, with a dotted ק for קרי under it.

Of the many things in the Cairo text of Ecclesiasticus which require discussion, we must here restrict ourselves to a few specimens.

Sir. iii 17 *My son, in thy wealth walk in meekness; And thou shalt be more beloved than one that giveth gifts.* Thus the Cambridge *B. S.* renders—

בני בעשרך התהלך בענוה   ותאהב מנותן מתנות׃

The present Greek of the latter hemistich is καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δεκτοῦ ἀγαπηθήσῃ, and the Latin *et super hominum gloriam* (δόξαν) *diligeris*. Neither of these renderings, I think, can be right[1].

Changing δεκτοῦ to δοτικοῦ we should get a fair rendering of נותן מתנות. The Hebrew and the Latin then suggest ὑπέρ for ὑπό. Accordingly I would read—

καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον **δοτικὸν** ἀγαπηθήσῃ.

A word δοτικός not extant elsewhere in the Bible would be readily corrupted into the familiar δεκτός. The Syro-hex. notes in the margin that its word for δεκτοῦ means acceptable to God, cf. Prov. xxii 8–9, LXX ἄνδρα ἱλαρὸν καὶ δότην εὐλογεῖ ὁ θεός . . . νίκην καὶ τιμὴν περιποιεῖται ὁ δῶρα δούς, 2 Cor. ix 7 ἱλαρὸν γὰρ δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός.

The Syriac of Sir. iii 17 agrees with the Hebrew, except that it ends ܢܪܚܡܘܢܟ, *they shall love thee*, not 'diligêris' (Walton). The Cairene וְתֵאָהֵב being supported by the Greek, the Latin, and the Arábic, we may conclude that the MS gives the original Hebrew of the verse, and not a retranslation from the Syriac.

Sir. iii 21, 22 *Search not the things that are too wonderful for thee; And seek not that which is hid from thee. What thou art permitted, think thereupon; But thou hast no business with the secret things.* The Hebrew for this is—

פלאות ממך אל תדרוש   ומכוסה ממך אל תחקור׃
במה שהורשית התבונן   ואין לך עסק בנסתרות׃

Of the numerous citations of this saying in Rabbinic literature notice especially:

---

[1] In Prov. x 24 the LXX may have read חן for Heb. *yitten*, A.V. *shall be granted*. In any case its δεκτή there is not like δεκτός for words meaning δῶρα δούς.

(1) Talm. Babli Chagigah 13 *a*—

שכן כתוב בספר בן סירא
במופלא ממך אל תדרוש ובמכוסה ממך אל תחקור
במה שהורשית התבונן אין לך עסק בנסתרות.

(2) Talm. Jerus. Chagigah ii 1 (77 *c*)—

רבי לעזר בשם בר סירה
פליאה ממך מה תדע עמוקה משאול מה תחקור
במה כו׳.

(3) Beresh. Rab. viii 2—

ר׳ אלעזר בשם בן סירא אמר
(*α*) בגדול ממך אל תדרוש בחזק ממך בל תחקור
(*β*) במופלא ממך בל תדע במכוסה ממך אל תשאל
במה כו׳.

In each case verse 22 is given with little or no deviation from the Cairo text; but verse 21 is cited nearly as it stands in the MS in (1) only, where the 'Book of Ben Sira' is quoted. In (2) and (3) his saying is given as on the authority of an oral tradition without mention of any book. In (2) verse 21 is much altered under the influence of Job xi 8 עמקה משאול מה תדע, 'It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?' with perhaps a reminiscence of Psalm cxxxix 6 פליאה דעת ממני.

The Midrash has expanded verse 21 into a doublet. Comparing (3) with (1), we find במופלא ממך and במכסה in (*β*), but תדרוש and תחקור in (*α*). Comparing (3) with (2), we find תחקור in (*α*), תדע in (*β*), and likewise אל תשאל probably suggested by עמוקה משאול, cf. Isaiah vii 11 העמק שאלה. It has been inadvertently remarked (*J. Q. R.* xii 287) that the Babli citation (1) is identical with that of the Midrash (3).

In the 'Midrash Haggadol' (*J. Q. R.* iii 699) the saying במופלא כו׳ is introduced without mention of Ben Sira as a tradition of 'our Rabbis,' and it ends, with variants in verse 22—

במה שהרשיתה דרוש ואין לך עסק בנפלאות.

Ben Sira's saying about 'the secret things' was evidently founded upon Deut. xxix 28—

הנסתרות ליהוה אלהינו והנגלות לנו ולבנינו עד עולם

which would have suggested also his dative לך. In Hebrew Bibles the letters of לנו ולבנינו עד except *daleth* are dotted. In Talm. Babli Sanhedrin 43 *b* it is inferred by R. Jehudah that Israel were not bound by the secret things of the law until they had crossed the Jordan. In Talm. Jerus. Sotah vii 5 (22 *a*) the discussion is closed by a Bath Kol, 'Ye have no occupation in the secret things.' Thus a hemistich of Ben Sira (exc. *ye* for *thou*) is quoted as a voice from heaven, and it is connected with Deut. xxix 28.

Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer regard Saadyah's quotation from Ben Irai (*Orig. Heb. of Ecclus.* p. xix) as perhaps giving the original text of Sir. iii 21, 22. In this quotation verse 22 begins באשר, not במה ש׳.

The following note on verse 21 is made up of extracts from Holmes and Parsons with additions in brackets:

Χαλεπώτερά σου] *βαθύτερά σου* 253 (ℵ^ca ap. Swete, Syro-hex., Talm. Jerus.). *Altiora te* Origen ii 488 (Vet. Lat.). *ἰσχυρότερά σου* Chrysost. ii 127. Cyrill. Alex. iv 671. *μειζότερά σου* Isidor. Pel. p. 443 (Beresh. Rab.). *μὴ ζήτει*] + *αναισθητως* 248, 253. Compl. (Syro-hex.). *καὶ ἰσχυρότερά σου*] (Beresh. Rab.). *μὴ ἐξέταζε*] + *αφροσυνη* 248. Compl. (Syro-hex.).

B.

The two British Museum leaves of B, containing Sir. xxxi 12–31 and xxxvi 22–xxxvii 26, have been edited by the Rev. G. Margoliouth and published in No. 45 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Oct. 1899).

Sir. xxxi 21 A.V. *And if thou hast been forced* [Est. i 8] *to eat, arise, go forth, vomit, and thou shalt have rest.* 'The addition "vomit" (248, Co., and Lat.) is a suggestion of the purpose for which any one would rise; a suggestion drawn, we may hope, from Roman rather than from Hebrew customs' (Edersheim).

The Hebrew, which ends קוה קוה וינוח לך, is rendered by Mr. Margoliouth, 'And even if thou hast been constrained with dainties, *keep on hoping*, and thou shalt have ease.' Prof. Schechter writes on קוה קוה (*J. Q. R.* xii 269), 'Cf. Jer. xxv 27, Keri קיו, Kethib קוו. See also Gesenius (vomit). The matter was by no means so uncommon with the Jews as Edersheim believes,' and refers to Shabbath 147 *b*, namely for a passage quoted by Buxtorf under אפיקטויזין.

Changing the first קוה into קום, I would read as the original Hebrew—

וגם אם נאנסת במטעמים   קום קוה וינוח לך:

From קום קוה comes *ἀνάστα ἔμεσον*, and then by a simple corruption *ἐκ μέσου*, *e medio*, Lat. *surge e medio evome*, a double rendering, Syr. *e medio turbae* and so Syro-hex., reading not *μεσοπορῶν* but probably *ἐκ μέσου*.

H. & P. on xxxiv 21, '*ἀνάστα* &c. ad fin. com.] *αναστας επεσον* (fors. *εμεσον*) *και υγιης εση* 23. *μεσοπωρῶν*] *μεσοπορων* 68, 106, 254, 307. Ald. *μεσοπορων, εμεσον* 248. Compl. (Alex. cum *ἔμεσον* in charact. minore.) *καὶ ἀναπαύσῃ*] *και αναπαυσει* 155, 308.'

Sir. l 3 *In whose generation a cistern was digged; A store like the sea in its abundance.* At the end of page lxxv in the Cambridge *B. S.* I referred to an attempted derivation by Prof. D. S. Margoliouth of אשיח בם בהמונו from a hypothetical Persian rendering of *λάκκος ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης τὸ περίμετρον.* This is first rendered into Persian, the Persian for *περίμετρον* is then said to account for המון, the rest of the Persian is used up in accounting for אשיח, and nothing is left for בם. Thus the explanation is inadequate, בם being obviously a clerical error for כים the original of *ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης*.

The Greek *τὸ περίμετρον* looks like an indifferent rendering of בהמונו, which Ben Sira may have used with allusion to the Biblical המון מים. On behalf of אֲשׁוּחַ as the original of *λάκκος* it may be said that it seems to have had the required sense *store-pit*, and that of possible words it is the most like אשיח.

Sir. l 27 אשר ניבע כפתור לבו. Prof. W. Bacher, who has some good 'Notes on the Cambridge Fragments of Ecclesiasticus' in No. 46 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Jan. 1900), accounts for כפתור very satisfactorily as a corruption of כפרת, *like the Euphrates*, cf. Sir. xxiv 25–27 R.V., 'It is he that maketh wisdom abundant, as Pishon, And as Tigris in the days of new *fruits*; That maketh understanding full as Euphrates, And as Jordan in the days of harvest; That maketh instruction to shine forth as the light (?), As Gihon in the days of vintage.' But for 'as the light' (כאור) read 'as the Nile' (כיאר), comparing Sir. xlvii 14 ותצף כיאר מוסר. 'Sirach, in his proud consciousness of having produced so great a wealth of wise sayings, says in this concluding phrase that he had made his heart flow like the Euphrates.' Sir. l 27 thus emended illustrates St. John vii 38, on which see *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 144 (1897).

C.

Two leaves of a third manuscript C, found at Cambridge by Dr. Schechter in February last, were published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (April, 1900), and a third leaf, apparently from the same MS, has been found at Paris by Prof. Isr. Lévi and edited for the *Revue des Études Juives* (Tome xl, No. 79).

The two Cambridge leaves, which are joined together, are described as measuring 14·3 × 10 cm. 'The writing is in a large hand, but its decipherment is sometimes rendered difficult by the fact that the sign ו may stand for *vaw*, *yod*, and even *resh*. There is also no sufficient distinction between *beth* and *kaph* and between *resh* and *daleth*. The number of lines on each page and of words in each line is very small.' Thus the first of the two leaves, which contain merely extracts, like (for example) the Oxyrhynchus *Logia*, includes only the whole or part of

Sir. iv 23, 30, 31, v 4–7, 9–13; the second, of which part is torn away, begins at chap. xxv 8; and the missing central sheet or sheets of the quire, to which the said Paris leaf seems to belong, would have contained extracts from the intermediate chapters.

Fol. 1, recto, has twelve lines, beginning with the two—

iv 23 b תקפוץ את חכמתך · 30 אל תהי
כאריה בביתך ומתפחז בעבודתך ·

Verse 30 is rendered in the A.V., *Be not as a lion in thy house, nor frantick among thy servants.* 'For *a lion* the Syr. vers. has *a dog*; evidently כלב for כלבי, *as a lion*' (Edersheim). Notice that *dog* and *lion* come together in Eccles. ix 4; and compare Ecclus. xxv 16, xxvi 25.

The Cambridge *B. S.* reads—

אל תהי ככלב בביתך ומוזר ומתירא במלאכתך:

The Greek of Fritzsche, with a variant from H. & P. is—

μὴ ἴσθι ὡς λέων ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου,
καὶ φαντασιοκοπῶν (al. -σκοπῶν) ἐν τοῖς οἰκέταις σου.

All things considered, I would suggest for the original Hebrew—

אל תהי כְּאַרְיֵה בביתך   וּמִתְיָרֵא בעבדיך:

The natural Hebrew for 'lion' here is אריה (or ארי) rather than לביא, and *aryeh* would have suggested *mithyaré*. The synonymous מתפחד with a clerical error accounts for מתפחז C; the LXX may have turned מתירא into מתראה; and בעבדיך, ἐν τοῖς οἰκέταις σου, is obviously the word to follow מתירא as a parallel to בביתך.

Sir. v 9, C (1 verso)—

אל תהי זורה לכל רוח   ואל תלך לכל שביל:

The verse according to A was translated in the Cambridge *B. S.*—

Be not winnowing with every wind,
And turning the way of the stream (𝔐).

By this translation I meant to represent the text of A without suggesting that the Hebrew translated was right (Pref. p. x). Prof. A. A. Bevan in this Journal (p. 139) rightly remarks that שבולת, *stream*, is a corruption of שביל, *path*, for which דרך, *way*, is a synonym. The Greek ἐν πάσῃ ἀτραπῷ suggests בכל שביל with ב׳ for ל׳, as without doubt we should read in C thus—

ואל תלך בכל שביל:

In the Syriac, 'Ne vela committas cuilibet vento, & ad quamcumque semitam ne te vertas,' there is perhaps a corruption of דרא, *winnowing*, into רדא.

Sir. v 11, C (1 verso)—

היה נכון בשמועה טובה ובארך . . . ענה תענה נכונה:

This I take to be a corruption of something more or less like the reading of A—

היה ממהר להאזין ובארך רוח השב פתגם:

The Greek of Fritzsche is—

Γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου,
καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν.

H. & P., '*Γίνου ταχὺς*] praemitt. *μη* 55, 254. *ἐν ἀκροάσει σου*] *εν ακροασει αγαθη* 106, 253. + *αγαθη* 248. Compl. *ἀπόκρισιν*] + *ορθην* 248, 253. Compl.'

In A we should probably read לשמוע for להאזין. In C נכונה (נכוחה?) implies that a noun once preceded; but a possible ending of the verse in some stage of its corruption was ענה תענה without the epithet. In the original Hebrew may have stood פתגם or מענה, *ἀπόκρισιν*. It is remarkable that variants in the Greek correspond, here and elsewhere, to variants in the Hebrew.

Sir. xxv 18, C (2 recto)—

בין רעים ישב בעלה ובלא טעמו יתאנח:

A.V. 17, *The wickedness of a woman changeth her face, and darkeneth her countenance like sackcloth* (marg. *like a bear*, C לדוב). 18, *Her husband shall sit among his neighbours; and when he heareth it shall sigh bitterly.*

H. & P. on 18, '*καὶ ἀκούσας*] *και ακουσιως* 248. Compl. *και ακουσασα* 296.' Edersheim on *ἀκουσίως*, 'As the Syr. has the same, we imagine that this must be the correct reading.'

Possibly בלא טעמו was the original Hebrew of *ἀκουσίως*, although this at first suggests rather the phrase שלא לדעתו of *Pirké Aboth* III (*Jewish Fathers*, p. 60, *App.* p. 153). 'Without טעם' would have meant *without reason*, but the phrase in C is 'without his טעם.' To a retranslator the Syriac might have suggested בלא צביונו, *ἀκουσίως*.

The Paris folio of C contains the whole or part of Sir. vi 18, 19, 28, 35, vii 1, 4, 6, 17, 20, 21, 23–25.

Sir. vii 20, C—

אל תרע עבד עובד אמת וכן שכיר נותן נפשו:

Lévi, 'תרע est la leçon qu'avait restituée M. Schechter. באמת avant עובד, qui avait fort embarrassé MM. Schechter et Taylor, doit être effacé; c'est probablement une correction marginale de אמת, qui suit ce mot: באמת vaudrait mieux, en effet.—שוכר de A doit être corrigé en שכיר comme en' C, which Lévi calls 'D.'

Some things in *B. S.* have embarrassed me, but this verse is not one of them. The reading of A, as edited, being—

אל תרע באמת עובד אמת וכן שוכר נותן נפשו

Dr. Schechter proposed to read תרע with *resh*, and to read שכיר for שוכר. I then, reading עבד for the first אמת, translated the verse thus—

Evil entreat not a servant that laboureth truly (?);
Nor a hireling that giveth his soul (?).

The notes of interrogation (?) mean in this case (p. xiv) that the proposed emendations were adopted as fairly obvious. So chap. vi 28 *b* is translated—

And she (?) shall turn to a delight unto thee,

ונהפך masc. not having much troubled ('gêné') the Cambridge editors.

D.

The number of the *Revue des Études Juives* (No. 79, Janv.–Mars, 1900) already referred to contains an account by Prof. Isr. Lévi of two new fragments of Ecclesiasticus, from MSS which he calls C and D. The latter MS having been described as C in this article, the former will be called D.

Lévi begins thus:

'Des marchands qui avaient vendu en Angleterre nombre de ballots de feuillets trouvés dans la *gueniza* (et peut-être dans le cimetière) du Caire sont venus à Paris proposer le restant de leur lot, dont personne n'avait voulu. Sur ma prière, M. le baron Edmond de Rothschild, dont le zèle généreux pour les études juives ne saurait être trop loué, a bien voulu acheter ces pièces de rebut et en a fait don à la Bibliothèque du Consistoire israélite de Paris, me laissant le soin de les examiner à loisir. Je comptais fort peu y trouver des documents de valeur, mes confrères anglais ayant vraisemblablement écrémé cet amas de débris informes; je n'espérais pas du tout même y rencontrer de fragments de l' *Ecclésiastique* hébreu, qui est en ce moment à l'ordre du jour.'

To his surprise he finds two leaves 'de l'ouvrage de Ben Sira.' Comparing one of them, the leaf of the MS which we call D, with B, Lévi writes, 'Sauf quelques exceptions, *il représente exactement le texte d'où sont tirées les notes marginales, même avec les fautes de copiste* qui se reconnaissent à vue d'œil, à tel point que, n'étaient ces exceptions, on pourrait croire que l' exemplaire dont ce feuillet a été arraché était celui-là même qu'avait sous les yeux l'annotateur de B.'

The *Recto* of this fragment, as edited in the *Revue des Études Juives* (p. 3), is as follows:

xxxvi 24 ק̄[ונ]ה̄ א̄ש̄ה̄ ר̄א̄ש̄[ית] ק̄[ני]ן̄ עיר מבצר ועמו̄ד̄ מ̄ש̄ע̄ן̄:
25, 26 באין גדר יבוׄעַר כרם ובאין אשה נע ונד: מי יאמין
26 *c* בגדוד צבא המדלג מעיר אל עיר: כן איש אשר
xxxvii 1 אין לו קן המרגיע באשר יערב: כל אוהב אומר
2 אהבתי אך יש אהב שם אהב: הלא דין מגיע
3 עד מות ריע כנפש נהפך לצר: הֹוי רַ֫ע יֹאמַ֑ר מדוע
4 נוצָ֫רתי לְמַלֵּ֫א פְּנֵי תֵבֵ֑ל תַּרְמִית: מרע אוהב
מביט על שחת ובעת צוקה מנגב יעמד:
5 אוהב טוב נלחם עם זר ונגד ערים יחזיק צנה:
6, 7 אל תשכח חבר בְּקֶרֶב ואל תעזבהו בשללך: כל
8 יועץ אומר חזה אך יש יועץ דרך עליו: מ̄יו̄ע̄ץ
8 *c* שמר נפשך ודע לפנים מה צרכו: כי גם הוא
9 נפשו יחשב למה זה אליו יפול: ואמר לך להביט
10 דרכיך וקם מנגד להביט ראשך: אל תועץ עם
11 ח̄מיך וממקנא העלים סוד: עם אשה אל צרתה
11 *c* ומלוכד על מלחמה: עם סוחר אל תת̄גר̄ ומקונה
11 *e* על ממכרו: עם איש רע על גמילות חסד
11 *g* ואכזרי על טוב בשר: פועל שכיר על מלאכתו̄
12 שכיר שנה על מוצא זרע: אך אם איש מפחד
תמיד

Lévi gives the *Verso* as well as the *Recto*, with facsimiles of both, and the corresponding parts of B, from No. 45 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and the Cambridge *B. S.* The margin of B is called *m* in the following notes.

Chap. xxxvi 24] קונה (*m*) is not legible in the facsimile. D*m* עיר מבצר, B עזר ומבצר. 25] B יבוער, Gr. διαρπαγήσεται (?). The same word בער was probably used in Sir. vi 2. 26 *c*] D*m* אין לו, B לא.

Chap. xxxvii 1] D*m* agree exc. in a *vau*, B כל אומר אמר אהבתי with verse 2 in place of 1 *b*. 2] D עד, *m* על, B אל. D*m* כנפש, B כנפשך. 3] The facsimile has תפל, not תבל with *beth*. Gr. ὦ πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα as if for הוי יצר רע, Syr. read צר ורע (D.S.M., *Jewish Fathers*, p. 152) omitting לצר in verse 2. B מדוע כן נוצרתי, D*m* מ׳ נוצרתי om. כן. Reading הוי יֵצֶר רַע מדוע נוֹצַרְתָּ we may conjecture that *m* דיֵע (?) is perhaps a corruption of יֵ׳ רע. The whole verse has points and accents, like some verses of A (p. 572). 4] B אל שלחן, D על שחת, *m* אל שחת. B מנגד, *m* מנגב, D מנוֹב with vowel-point. Lévi in text מנגב with note (p. 16) that it should be מנוב (*sic*). Sir. vi 10 *There is a friend that is a companion at the table.* D*m* שחת is an unmeaning variant for שלחן,

table, D מנוב a corruption of מנגב, itself a corruption of מנגד, ἀπέναντι. 6] D בְּקֶרֶב (?), B בקרב, *m* בקרב and בקבר. The pointing of the *beth* is ambiguous. The noun is properly קְרָב, *battle*. With בְּקֶרֶב *cf.* Gr. ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου, or it may be a corruption of *m* (2) pointed בְּקֶבֶר, *in the grave*, with *beth*, *resh* accidentally retransposed. 7] D perhaps agrees exactly with *m*, which the editor has not completely deciphered. 12] *But* (take counsel) *with* איש מפחד תמיד (Prov. xxviii 14), as Lévi well explains the clause. Read with D*m* איש, and restore עם for אם. B אם יש as a correction of את איש.

These examples justify Lévi's description of D in relation to B and *m*. The worthless variant שחת[1] (xxxvii 4) well illustrates the scribe's scrupulous reproduction of whatever he found in his authorities, while מנוב testifies to an earlier text with מנגב for מנגד. It was obvious from the first that the readings of *m* are not all corrections or possible alternatives, and D now brings us nearer to the source of some which are old clerical errors carefully preserved.

The Original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.

On the question of the character of the Cairene *B. S.*, M. Lévi now concludes that it is not of uniform excellence. Referring to some chapters as 'sinon l'original pur, du moins une copie assez fidèle de l'original,' he continues, 'Mais comme on le remarquera aussi, dans ces morceaux relativement authentiques *jamais* n'apparaissent les rabbinismes déconcertants qui avaient tant choqué dans le chapitre final, dans les pages à doublets et, comme nous allions le montrer, dans maints passages du ms. A. En particulier, *jamais* ne se rencontre le ש *relatif*.' Lastly, on Mr. Elkan Adler's two leaves 'd'un autre ms.' it is said, 'dans tous ces quatre chapitres *pas un exemple du* ש *relatif*.' But this 'autre ms.' is really A itself.

Ever ready to give fresh evidence its due, M. Lévi has repeatedly modified his view of the Cairo text. On the publication of the Lewis-Gibson folio he questioned its originality. The Oxford *Original Hebrew of Ecclus.* turned him into a staunch defender of it. The Cambridge *B. S.* at once reconverted him. Somewhat overrating, perhaps, the latest discoveries, he now regards parts of the text as 'relativement authentiques.' Whether, or how often, Ben Sira used the Biblical ש *relatif* is an unimportant detail. But M. Lévi has quite changed his opinion about Ben Sira's original Hebrew and its 'néologismes' (Camb. *B. S.* p. vii).

Prof. D. S. Margoliouth in his *Inaugural Lecture* on Ecclesiasticus (1900) writes that, with Dr. Edersheim, he 'had worked under the tacit assumption that the language of Ben Sira was the language of the Prophets; whereas in reality he wrote the language of the Rabbis.' In No. 47 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (April, 1900) he questions the genuineness of the extant fragment of *Sefer ha-Galuy*, and its editor Dr. A. Harkavy replies. In the course of his reply he writes that 'Saadiah,' who does not quote *B. S.* in his earlier works, 'most likely discovered the original of Ben Sira, after his dismissal from office, among the hidden treasures of the Academy of Sura,' in 934–5 A. D.

---

[1] The corruption may have been of ancient date, שחת coming from שחנ, and that from שלחנ written with medial *nun*.

Manuscripts of Ben Sira's *Wisdom* in Hebrew must always have been few and far between, and there was no obligation to quote it with the same care as the Bible. Sayings in his book were accordingly cited orally, and the verse Sir. iii 21 for example has thus been made into two (p. 573), for sayings cited by word of mouth tend to increase and multiply. Some variants even in the Greek (p. 574) are clearly due to citation from memory, and such citation was probably more in vogue in the case of the Hebrew. Of the few Hebrew MSS of *B. S.*, some, like C, would have been incomplete, and missing verses might have been restored, more or less accurately, from memory, with or without the help of a version. By this process synonyms would be substituted for words of Ben Sira, not to speak of further deviations from the true text of his *Wisdom*.

M. Lévi's seemingly sudden conversion by a glance at the Cambridge *B. S.* may be accounted for by some of its notes, which, however, he does not always quote quite accurately. In the acrostic in chap. li the *shin* line should of course begin with שמעו (p. li), not רבים. The note about this on page lxxxiv is reproduced twice over in the *Études Juives*, apparently as new, while on another verse I am credited with a conjecture which I have quoted in the original German from Bickell (p. lxxxvi).

At the end of the *Appendix* is the Hebrew of the verse (li 26 *a*),

And bring your neck into her yoke;
And let your soul take up her burden.

The Greek for the second hemistich being *καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν*, and the Syriac agreeing with the Greek, I suggested that the Hebrew with its better parallelism *yoke*, *burden*, perhaps gives the original form of the verse with a *vau* prefixed. Lévi merely points to this superfluous letter as evidence for the retranslation theory, and has nothing to say about the clause ומשאה תשא נפשכם in which the Hebrew differs from the versions. Compare Sir. vi. 21, 25.

Sir. xxx 20 נאמן.] In a footnote (p. xxxvi) I remarked in passing that נאמן 'might be thought to be' a translation from the Syriac מהימן, and M. Lévi concludes that it certainly is. The Cairo text brings together Sir. xxx 20 and xx 4 A. V. With סרים for סירים, כנאמן for כן נ׳, and a rearrangement, we have for the Hebrew of these verses,

xxx 20 בעינו * * *
כאשר סרים יחבק נערה ומתאנח :
xx 4 כנאמן לָן עם בתולה
כן עושה באונ̊ם (marg. בגזל) משפט :
וייי מבקש מידו̊ (marg. ? בידו) :

The Syriac is represented by:

xxx 20 Videtque oculis suis ac suspirat;
Ceu eunuchus prope virginem cubans.
Dominus autem manu sua ulciscetur.
xx 4 Desiderat eunuchus cum virgine concumbere;
Talis est qui iudicium cum oppressione exercet.

The corresponding Greek of the two verses is:

xxx 20 . . . *βλέπων ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ στενάζων,*
ὥσπερ εὐνοῦχος περιλαμβάνων παρθένον καὶ στενάζων.
xx 4 *ἐπιθυμία εὐνούχου τοῦ ἀποπαρθενῶσαι νεάνιδα,*
οὕτως ὁ ποιῶν ἐν βίᾳ κρίματα.

If the Hebrew is a translation from the Syriac, why has it two words for each of the three מהימן, בתולתא, דמך? If it came from the Greek and the Syriac, why in xx 4 has it not something like תאות סרים כו׳? The Hebrew really represents differences of meaning in the two verses, which the Greek and the Syriac fail to bring out.

Sir. xxx 20.] In this verse there is no difficulty. Of one who has wealth which he cannot enjoy (Heb., Syr.) it is said that he merely sees with his eyes, *Ceu eunuchus*, &c. Syr. renders יחבק נערה loosely, without properly distinguishing it from לָן כו׳. There being here no question of wrongdoing, Syr. misplaces *Dominus autem manu sua ulciscetur*, a pious reflexion suitable for xx 4 marg. Syr. having nothing for the second *καὶ στενάζων*, it may be conjectured that Heb. read:

בעיניו [יביט ויתאנח] כאשר סרים יחבק (or כמ׳ מחבק) נערה :

Sir. xx 4.] Commentators on Gr. and Syr. have found this verse hard to interpret. Edersheim writes, 'We should be disposed to regard this as an interpolation. . . . If, however, . . .' Ryssel in Kautzsch *Die Apokryphen* (1898) on *eunuch* in xx 4, 'd. i. hier (*anders* 30, 20) ein solcher . . ,' the same sense not suiting both verses. Taking Ben Sira's idea to be, that 'A judge perverting justice for his own advantage is as a *guardian* dishonouring his ward,' we have to see whether the Hebrew can be interpreted in that sense.

Num. xii 7 (Heb. iii 2) נאמן בכל ביתי, *faithful in all my house*. Onk. מְהֵימַן, cf. Targ. Jerus.] The *Speaker's Commentary* aptly paraphrases

נאמן כו׳, 'approved by me as my vicegerent,' Moses being described as holding an office of trust as well as being worthy of it. He was על הבית, *οἰκονόμος*, *steward* (1 Kings xvi 9). St. Paul in 1 Cor. iv 2 may allude to a word for steward meaning *πιστός*, and Ben Sira may have used נאמן from Num. *l.c.* for the same or some such colloquial word, perhaps the Jewish Aramaic מהימן, in the sense *guardian*.

In Heb. כנאמן לָן עם בתולה the vowel-point is a mark of care in transcription. Gr. *τοῦ ἀποπαρθενῶσαι* possibly as a rendering of לענות for לנעם with medial *nun*, and then *νεάνιδα* instead of *παρθένον* (xxx 20). In favour of בגזל note that *βία* is Aquila's word for גזל. 'Επιθυμία, Syr. *Desiderat*, was a natural interpolation when the subject of xx 4 *a* was imagined to be *εὐνοῦχος*.

But to conclude, I wish chiefly to suggest for consideration the hypothesis that oral teaching and tradition are partly responsible for the present imperfections of a text of which complete transcripts were never everywhere accessible.

C. TAYLOR.

A FRESH INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH xxi 1–10.

THERE is hardly a more difficult prophecy in the whole range of prophetical literature than Isa. xxi 1–10—*if it be correctly interpreted in the main by the majority of ancient and modern critics.* If Jerome, Aben Ezra, and Calvin, Ewald, Dillmann, and Duhm, Cheyne (*Introduction to Isaiah*, pp. 121–128), Driver (*Isaiah*, second edition, p. 216 ff.), and G. A. Smith (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, ii 493 a) have rightly divined the occasion of the prophecy, then the whole passage simply teems with exegetical difficulties. 'Der Fall Babels durch die Elamiter und Meder als Trostruf für das niedergetretene Israel ist der wesentliche Inhalt,' wrote Dillmann (*Jesaia*, fifth edition, p. 187). 'There is no sufficient reason to doubt that xxi 1–10 relates to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus,' says Dr. Cheyne more cautiously (*Introduction to Isaiah*, p. 128).

I confess that I have doubts of the correctness of the view to which so many great names have given adhesion. Dr. Cheyne himself at one time believed that some Assyrian siege of Babylon (by Sargon ?) furnished the occasion of the prophecy (cf. *Introduction*, pp. 122–124). Dr. Driver also inclined towards the same view in the first edition of his *Introduction* (p. 205). To me it seems that vv. 1–6 and 9, 10 agree better with the earlier view of the two English scholars than with the later view, shared by them with most German critics. Moreover, while I confess that vv. 6–10 are correctly referred by the Commentators to a capture of Babylon by an enemy, I venture in spite of all critics to believe that vv. 1–5 refer to something with which Isaiah is more nearly concerned, viz., to an impending siege of Jerusalem. I propose here briefly to examine the passage verse by verse.

Ver. 1. *The burden of the Desert of the Sea* (or *of the West*). *As whirlwinds in the South* (Hebrew, *the Negeb*) *he will pass through; he cometh from the desert, from a terrible land.*

'The Desert of the Sea' is the south-west district of Palestine about Gaza (cf. Acts viii 26) bordering on the Mediterranean. 'The South' (the *Negeb*) is the neighbouring part of Judah. The 'Terrible Land' is most probably the 'Land of trouble and anguish' mentioned in xxx 6, i. e. the desert which lies between Judah and Egypt.

Now if vv. 1–5 relate to Babylon, as our interpreters believe, ver. 1 forms a most extraordinary beginning to the prophecy. Why (*ex hypothesi*) should not the inscription be, *The Burden of Babylon* as in xiii 1? The prophet is not afraid to utter the name of Babylon (cf. ver. 9), and no critic has been able to give any satisfactory reason why Babylon should be called by a name descriptive of the south-west of Judah, the *Desert of the Sea* (or *of the West*). The LXX does not give any real help by its rendering τὸ ὅραμα τῆς ἐρήμου (—θαλάσσης), which Duhm has adopted in his rendering, *Orakel* '*Wüste*'; such an indefinite rendering will satisfy no one, for the purpose of this inscription (as of the inscription of the following chapters and as of inscriptions generally) is to define. Moreover the LXX version of Isa. xxi 1–10 is a characteristic illustration of Zuingli's dictum: *Esaias nactus est interpretem sese indignum;* cf. the omissions in ver. 4 (חשקי) and ver. 5 (צפה הצפית). In short the *Desert of the Sea* (or *of the West*) must be taken in its obvious sense, and we are left asking, Why, if vv. 1–5 relate to Babylon, are the frontier lands of Judah and Egypt enumerated to the exclusion of other lands, in ver. 1?

I can only answer that the hypothesis is incorrect. I believe that vv. 1–5 relate to the south of Judah and to Jerusalem, which are threatened with a danger which approaches them from the south-west.

Ver. 2. *A grievous vision! It is told me, The treacherous dealer will deal treacherously, and the destroyer will destroy; yea, he saith, Go up, O Elam, Besiege, O Madai. I stilled all my sighing.*

Again the interpreters are in trouble. Who is *the treacherous dealer, the destroyer?* In an oracle against Babylon, the *treacherous dealer* ought to be the Chaldean (so Dillmann, fifth edition), but Duhm and Kittel (in the sixth edition of Dillmann) both see that the Chaldean is not meant here. According to them the treacherous dealer, the spoiler, is to be identified with Elam-Madai who goes up against Babylon. But if one difficulty is laid, another is raised up. In xiii 3 the assailants of

Babylon are the Lord's *sanctified ones, His mighty ones*; in xliv 28 and xlv 1 Cyrus their leader is the Lord's *shepherd* and the Lord's *anointed*. If in xxi 2 Cyrus' army is simply *treacherous dealer and destroyer*, then xxi 1–5 is very different in tone from all other prophecies against Babylon. We may indeed accept *destroyer* from a comparison with Jer. l 42, Isa. xiii 16, but I am at a loss to know why the prophet should bring the charge of *treacherous dealing* against the avengers of his people.

If, however, vers. 1–5 refer to the Judah of Isaiah's day, then we may confidently identify *the treacherous dealer, the destroyer*, of this passage with *the destroyer, the treacherous dealer* of xxxiii 1, i. e. with Hezekiah's enemy, the Assyrian; cf. Driver (*Introduction*, fifth edition, p. 213), where a reason is suggested for the application of the term בוגד ('treacherous dealer') to Sennacherib.

But a further difficulty for the usual interpretation lies in the very collocation of names which is taken to prove the reference of these verses to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus (cf. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 205; Duhm, *Jesaia*, p. 126). Elam and Madai (מָדַי, 'the Medes'?) are here associated in attacking some city. Now it has become a fashion to call Cyrus an Elamite (not a Persian), and it is known that Medes formed part—perhaps a large part—of his army. A modern writer therefore is very likely to describe the power to which Babylon succumbed in 539 B. C. as Elamite-Median. But here we are dealing with an ancient Hebrew writer, and we do not find that such writers (unless the present passage be the exception) use any such term in referring to the power of which Cyrus was the head. In Isa. xiii 17, and again in Jer. li 11, 28, the fall of Babylon is ascribed to Madai (מָדַי, 'the Medes'?), without any mention of Elam. In Isa. xliv 28, xlv 1 Cyrus is actually named, but no nationality is assigned him. Thus there is no Biblical evidence either for designating with the name 'Elam' the power which brought about the fall of Babylon in 539, or for styling Cyrus himself an 'Elamite.' A similar statement may be made concerning the direct evidence of the Monuments. In the cuneiform inscriptions Cyrus is 'king of Anzan' (or 'Anshan,' *K. I. B.* iii 2, p. 98, and *ibid.* p. 122), 'king of Parsu' ('Barsu,' i. e. Persia? *ibid.* p. 130), and (after his victory) 'king of Tintir' ('Babylon,' *ibid.* p. 124), but he is not called an 'Elamite' or 'king of Elam[1]' on any known inscription, though the name *Ilamti* (Elam) and the title *shar* (mâtu) *Ilamti* (king of Elam) occur very frequently in other contexts[2].

---

[1] 'Cyrus king of Elam' (Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 136) seems to be a slip for 'Cyrus king of Anshan'; cf. *K. I. B.* iii 2, p. 122.

[2] On Anshan, Dillmann (*Jesaia*, p. 187, sixth edition, ed. Kittel) writes: '[Anshan] ist schwerlich eine Localität Persiens, sondern wahrscheinlich der östliche oder nördliche Teil Elams, und scheint die pers. Dynastie hier längst festen Fuss gefasst zu haben.' I should be sorry to argue from this 'schwerlich' and

On the other hand if we refer vv. 1–5 to events which took place in Judah in Hezekiah's reign, the exegetical difficulties are but slight. It is true that on this hypothesis the Assyrian is not mentioned by his—too well-known—name, but by an epithet, 'the treacherous destroyer.' But this forms no objection to the hypothesis, for a parallel instance of this reserve is found in xvii 12–15 where the enemy is called, *a multitude of many peoples*, *the nations*, *them that spoil us*, *them that rob us*, but not once *the Assyrian*, though the Assyrian is undoubtedly meant. A still closer parallel is afforded by xxii 1–14, where the Assyrian auxiliaries 'Elam' and 'Kir' are mentioned by name; but not the Assyrian himself. Not even the mention of 'Madai' (מַדָי, 'the Medes') among the Assyrian vassals creates any difficulty, for as Dr. Cheyne remarks (*Introduction*, p. 123) the Assyrian kings from 810 B.C. onwards record their conquests in Media; cf. e.g. *K. I. B.* ii 2, p. 18, where Tiglath-pileser III records that he added an important city of the '(mâtu) Mādai' to the territory of Assyria.

But ver. 2 supplies a third difficulty for the interpreters in the words, *I stilled all my sighing*. The possessive pronoun is absent from the Hebrew (Massoretic Text), and scholars are practically divided between two opinions. Some, e.g. Dillmann (Kittel), translate, *I have made an end of all her sighing*, i.e. the sighing of Judah in captivity in Babylon. Others again agree with the dictum of Duhm, 'Ohne starke Änderung lässt sich schwerlich ein passender Sinn erzielen.' Certainly Duhm is right in saying that a word of comfort for Israel is out of place here, though it would be suitable enough in ver. 10.

But the words are closely connected with the opening words of ver. 3, and admit a quite easy explanation. The prophet shrinks from declaring his grievous vision, the coming siege of Jerusalem. He restrains his sighing, lest the secret should be revealed, but his restraint only increases his inward pain. He is as it were *in travail with his vision*. The sentiment is the same as in xlii 14, *I have long time holden my peace . . ., now will I cry out like a travailing woman.*

Vers. 3, 4. *Therefore are my loins filled with anguish; pangs have taken hold upon me, as the pangs of a woman in travail; I am pained so that I cannot hear; I am dismayed so that I cannot see. My heart panteth, horror hath affrighted me: the twilight that I desired is turned into trembling unto me.*

'wahrscheinlich' that 'Elam' in Isa. xxi 2 connotes Cyrus the conqueror of Babylon. In fact it seems hardly safe to build any argument on the identification of Anshan with part of Elam, for while Dillmann (Kittel) places it in the 'east' or 'north,' Driver (*Authority and Archaeology*, p. 124) describes it as 'a district in the south or south-west of Elam.' Surely it is not unreasonable to hesitate with our present evidence to see a reference to the king of 'Anshan' or of 'Parsu' in the term 'Elam.'

The lively distress of the prophet here expressed is very difficult to understand, if the city to be besieged (ver. 2) is Babylon. The difficulty is increased if we overhear a note of satisfaction in ver. 9. It is increased again if (with Duhm), while we hold that vv. 1–5 refer to the fate of Babylon, we say, 'Der Verfasser lebte wahrscheinlich in Palästina.' If we say that the prophet is distressed over Babylon, because Babylon had become 'Israel's second native city' (Ewald, in Cheyne's *Introduction*, p. 125), how are we to reconcile this distress with the apparent *satisfaction* expressed in ver. 9? And again how are we to reconcile such lively distress over Babylon with the (well-grounded) supposition that the writer lived in Judah? *Could* Babylon have become 'Israel's second native city' to one who lived in the land of Israel about 539 B. C.?

For myself I find fewer difficulties in the supposition that the speaker is Isaiah, and the city for which he fears, Jerusalem.

Ver. 5. *They prepare the table*, *they spread the carpets* (*divans*), *they eat*, *drink*—suddenly there is a cry—*Arise*, *ye princes*, *anoint the shields!*

Again the interpreters are confronted with a difficulty. It was this very verse which misled the earlier moderns to see a reference to Babylon in Isa. xxi 1–5. Herodotus (i 191) says that Cyrus captured Babylon by surprising the Babylonians, some of whom were dancing at the time τυχεῖν γάρ σφι ἐοῦσαν ὁρτήν. Similarly Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*, vii 5. 15) says that Cyrus began his successful assault ἐπειδὴ ἑορτὴν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἤκουσεν εἶναι, ἐν ᾗ πάντες Βαβυλώνιοι ὅλην τὴν νύκτα πίνουσι καὶ κωμάζουσιν. This scandalous account of the capture of the great city is now generally abandoned in favour of the more decorous story told on the Nabonid-Cyrus Chronicle: *Umu XVI Ug-ba-ru piḥu* (*mâtu*) *Gu-ti-um u ṣâbî Ku-raš ba-la ṣal-tum ana I.KI irubû*, 'On the sixteenth day Gobryas, the governor of Gutium, and the forces of Cyrus entered Babylon without fighting' (*K. I. B.* iii 2, p. 134[1]). I do not know whether the critics have really made out an important contradiction between Herodotus ('the popular account'?) and the Monuments ('the official story'?), but they have in any case a more serious difficulty to deal with in connexion with this verse.

This difficulty lies in the connexion between vv. 1–5 and 6–10. In ver. 5 the princes (of Babylon, according to the usual explanation) are called on to leave their banqueting and take up arms. Why? Because (ver. 6) the prophet has alarming tidings for them. What tidings? The tidings (ver. 9) that Babylon has fallen and all her idols are broken. Are we then to suppose that the prophet who sympathizes (*ex hypothesi*) with the Babylonians in vv. 3, 4, insults them with a cumbrous insult in ver. 5 by calling them to spring to arms—*too late*[1]*?*

---

[1] Cf. Cyrus' own statement that Merodach brought him into *Shuanna*—one of the quarters of Babylon—*ba-lu ḳab-li u taḥâzi*, 'without battle or conflict,' *K. I. B.* iii 2, p. 122.

I find it less difficult to believe that the speaker is Isaiah, and that here, as in xxii 13, he calls upon *his own people* to leave their banqueting.

Vers. 6, 7. *For thus hath the* LORD *said unto me, Go, set a watchman; let him declare what he seeth: and when he seeth a troop, horsemen in pairs, a troop of asses, a troop of camels, he shall hearken diligently with much heed.*

The stumbling-block for modern interpreters here is the opening word, *For.* Duhm says that it refers back to ver. 2; 'wir sollen jetzt die חזות kennen lernen.' This is quite a possible way of taking the *For*, but it is simpler to assume that the substance of the vision is given in ver. 2 and that vv. 6–10 give not the 'grievous vision' itself, but the explanation *why* the grievous vision must come and cannot be averted. Jerusalem (so I read the passage) has given herself up to rejoicing (ver. 5; cf. xxii 2, 13) because she has secured (amongst other allies) Merodach-baladan, the *de facto* king of Babylon, as her ally against Assyria (cf. xxxix 1 ff.). But in the midst of the rejoicings Isaiah calls upon his people to break off and prepare for a siege (vv. 2, 5), for the LORD has shown him in vision the fall of the trusted ally (vv. 6–9). The Assyrian commander on the border of Egypt will send from the south-west his Elamite and Median auxiliaries to take Jerusalem (vv. 1, 2). If it is asked, What events called forth this prophecy? we may refer in answer to two entries in Winckler's Chronological Table contributed to Benzinger's *Bücher der Könige* (p. 204). These are:—

'713–711. Aufstand von Gaza mit Hilfe von Pir'u von Muṣri, Philistaea, *Juda*, Edom, Moab.

710. Merodach-baladan aus Babylon verjagt.'

Isaiah thus foretells in 713–711 B.C. the event of the year 710.

Vers. 8, 9. *And he cried*[2] *as a lion: Upon the watch-tower, O Lord, I stand continually in the day-time, and I am set in my ward whole nights: and behold here cometh a troop of men, horsemen in pairs. And He answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods are broken unto the ground.*

Again there is a difficulty for the interpreters. If these verses describe the surrender of Babylon to Cyrus, why is there absolutely no allusion to the consequent deliverance of Israel from the Chaldean yoke? Other prophecies greet Cyrus as Israel's deliverer from the moment at which he began to threaten the Chaldean power, but this prophecy announces the fall of Babylon with a kind of cold impartiality. This cold tone is however easy to explain, if we may believe that Isaiah is announcing to the Judah of Hezekiah's day the failure of one more of the broken reeds upon which Judah endeavoured to rest in spite of the prophet's warning. Isaiah cannot exult in the disappointment of his people's hopes, nor in the victory of Assyria over Merodach-baladan, but the watchman must tell what he sees and the prophet must deliver his message.

---

[1] Aben Ezra, having doubtless marked the difficulty which arises from a comparison of ver. 5 with ver. 9, is driven to explain 'anoint the shield' to mean 'anoint Darius to be king'; cf. for this use of 'shield' Hos. iv 18, Ps. xlvii 9.

[2] Cf. Amos iii 8.

Ver. 10. *O my threshing and the corn of my floor, that which I have heard from the* LORD *of Hosts, the God of Israel have I declared unto you!*

Here Dillmann (p. 193, fifth edition, p. 191, sixth edition) remarks: 'In diesem Schluss hat das ganze Stück seine Spitze: es ist Israel zum Trost geschrieben und [כל אנחתה השבתי ver. 2] ist darnach zu verstehen.' But if the whole prophecy culminates, as Dillmann says, in this verse, the culmination is somewhat indefinite. Ver. 10, it seems, affords the proof that this discourse was composed 'for the comfort of Israel.' If so, the proof is weak. Certainly the tone of *sympathy* is heard, but to say that *comfort* is expressed in ver. 10 is to settle the question in dispute by making an assumption. *If* the capture of Babylon by Cyrus be meant, then the message is one of comfort; but if Sargon's victory be the subject, then the message is a sad one for Israel, and the prophet's sympathy avails little for comfort. The occasion of the prophecy, in short, must be gathered from more definite utterances such as those of vv. 1–5.

The usual view of Isa. xxi 1–10 is thus beset with exegetical difficulties, most of which it seems to me do not arise, if we may believe that vv. 1–5 refer to Judah and Jerusalem, and that vv. 6–10 refer to a capture of Babylon in the time of Isaiah by the Assyrians. The following explanation of the passage is, I believe, free from serious difficulty of any kind. This prophecy is the *Burden of Judah* (ver. 1); the *grievous vision* shows the dispatch of a detachment of the Assyrian army against Jerusalem (ver. 2); the prophet's distress and terror are great (vv. 3, 4), because his people are lost in careless confidence, and it is difficult to arouse them to a sense of their danger (ver. 5). But this danger is all the more pressing because the hoped-for diversion in the far East will utterly fail. The Assyrian king will secure his rear by the capture of Babylon (ver. 9). And Judah, oppressed as she is by the Assyrian, must not cherish the hope of help from Merodach-baladan (ver. 10).

The main reason then for supposing that certain events belonging to the reign of Hezekiah were the occasion of this prophecy, is that the exegetical difficulties are fewer and less important on this hypothesis than on the only alternative hypothesis which has hitherto been suggested. But there is another reason. Surely it is right to hold that the four Burdens (xxi 1–10; 11, 12; 13–17; xxii 1–14) are closely bound up with one another 'by their emblematic titles, by their form, and by their contents' (cf. Delitzsch, *Jesaia*, 3te Ausgabe, p. 241). They form one whole. But the part of the whole (xxii 1–14) which can be dated with the greatest confidence belongs (even according to Duhm) *to the reign of Hezekiah.*

One point more. The unity which underlies the four Burdens is a perfectly natural unity on the hypothesis defended in this paper, but it is a puzzle which needs solving on the alternative hypothesis. Judgement falls on the South of Judah (Judah's ally Babylon having failed), xxi 1–10; on Edom the near neighbour, 11, 12; on 'Arabia,' another neighbour, 13–17; and lastly, the whirlwind which has swept through the Negeb breaks upon the Valley of Vision, Jerusalem itself, xxii 1–14. Thus we have a description of a typical Assyrian expedition against the border of Egypt, illustrated by a reference to the Assyrian preponderance in the Euphrates valley which made such an expedition possible and safe. There is thus as real a connexion between the separate parts in this prophecy of the four Burdens as in Amos i 3—ii 6.

There still remains an important matter to be considered. Modern interpreters have sought to support their case by throwing doubt on the Isaianic authorship of the passage on linguistic grounds. Cheyne and Dillmann (Kittel) suggest that ver. 3 ('my loins are filled with *anguish*,' חלחלה) depends on Nahum ii 11, and that vv. 6, 8 depend on Hab. ii 1, i. e. that the writer of Isa. xxi 1–10 was dependent on prophets who lived a hundred years later than Isaiah, the son of Amoz. The coincidences referred to however do not appear upon consideration to be really important, and the suggestion remains nothing more than a suggestion. Nor is the list of 'non-Isaianic words' an impressive one. To call a word 'non-Isaianic' on the ground that it does not occur in any passage allowed to be genuine by Dr. Cheyne and Prof. Duhm is to assume too much. Very few words of any interest would pass so severe a test. How, for example, does Dr. Cheyne (*Introduction*, p. 67) know that 'Burden' (מַשָּׂא) is un-Isaianic? Is it because it is inconceivable that Isaiah would ever have prefixed a title (and a telling title!) to a prophecy? 'Vision' (חָזוּת) is, we are told, late; and if it occurs in xxix 11, that verse must be late and un-Isaianic too. 'Horror' (פַּלָּצוּת) is also 'non-Isaianic,' but as it also occurs only once in Ezekiel, once in Job, and once in the Psalms, it is also 'non-Ezekielic,' 'non-Jobic,' and 'non-Psalteric,' but these three interesting facts are passed over by modern critics. 'Sighing' (אֲנָחָה) is 'distinctively late,' though it occurs in Jeremiah xlv 3, and though the cognate verb נֶאֱנַח occurs in Ezekiel.

(I must not mention that it occurs in Isa. xxiv 7 in the midst of verses which have all the ring of Isaiah, for most modern scholars—on insufficient grounds, as it seems to me—deny Isa. xxiv—xxvii to Isaiah[1].) 'To be dismayed' (נבהל) is also 'unjesaianisch,' but it should be remembered that the word was used before Isaiah in the Song of the Red Sea (Ex. xv 15), and after Isaiah in Ezekiel (vii 27) and in Zephaniah (i 18), so that its appearance in Isaiah needs no apology. Lastly, it is said that the use of the infinitive with ל in לחלוף (ver. 1) is non-Isaianic, apparently on the ground (cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Grammar*, Eng. Trans., p. 365, 367) that the use of the infinitive here is different from its use in chap. x 32 (a confessedly Isaianic passage). But it is quite unnecessary to make this distinction. In chap. x 32 בנב לעמד means 'He is about (*or* He is destined) to halt at Nob,' and בנגב לחלוף means 'He is about (*or* He is destined) to pass through the Negeb.' I cannot see any difference between these two instances as to the use of the infinitive. On the whole the argument from phraseology seems to me very weak. We have here a passage uttered under the influence of very deep emotion. It is just the occasion on which we should expect unusual phraseology. We get it. On the other hand we have side by side with this much that is characteristic of Isaiah, as even the opponents of the Isaianic authorship confess; cf. Dillmann (Kittel), p. 185, and Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 125. Delitzsch (*Jesaia*, 3^{te} Ausgabe, p. 241) in defending the genuineness goes so far as to say, 'Gedanken und Gedankenausdruck sind bis ins Feinste so jesaianisch, dass jesaianischere Gestalt einer Weissagung rein undenkbar ist.' Enthusiastic words, but not without weight from so good a scholar!

To conclude. Verses 1–5 plainly refer to just such circumstances as those under which Isaiah delivered some of the weightiest of his prophecies. Vers. 6–10 can be more naturally referred to Sargon's capture of Babylon than to Cyrus' victory. Lastly, the style and phraseology of the whole passage (xxi 1–10) encourage us rather to attribute it than to deny it to the authorship of Isaiah.

Two notes may be added, the first on the reading of the Vulgate in ver. 4, the second on the reading of Theodotion in ver. 8.

Note 1. The Vulgate rendering of ver. 4 b is: *Babylon dilecta mea posita est mihi in miraculum.* This appearance of the word *Babylon* is startling; if it had been brought over from the Old Latin, it might conceivably represent the true reading of the LXX, and therefore possibly a real various reading in the Hebrew, which would seriously affect the position which I have defended above. Fortunately Jerome tells us that he himself introduced the word *Babylon* into the text. He writes (ed. Vallarsi, iv 214): ‘Pro eo autem quod nos vertimus: *Babylon dilecta mea* in Hebraeo legitur NESEPH ESCI [נֶשֶׁף חִשְׁקִי]; et est ipsum verbum quod in principio Babylonii Oneris posuimus, *super montem caliginosum* [הַר נִשְׁפֶּה]; pro *caliginoso* enim seu *tenebroso* scriptum est *Neseph*. Proprieque haec urbs sic vocatur, propter altitudinem, et erectum usque ad caelum superbiae verticem.’ Jerome's argument is not convincing.

---

[1] In an *Examination of the objections brought against the Genuineness of Isaiah xxiv–xxvii* (Thesis for the B.D. degree, Cambridge, 1891) I gave my reasons for believing that these chapters are Isaianic. I see no reason for abandoning this belief. There is in any case so much that is Isaianic in the language and manner of these chapters, that I cannot help feeling that modern critics in denying the Isaianic origin of the prophecy are swayed more by vague suspicions than by reasons having the nature of proofs.

Note 2. For the difficult אֲרְיֵה of ver. 8, Theodotion (Eusebius Caes. *in loco*; Q^{mg} cited by Swete) reads ’Αριήλ: cf. chap. xxix 1, 7. It would strengthen a little the case presented in this paper, if we might use this interpretation or various reading, so as to render, ‘And he cried, O Ariel, upon the Lord's watch-tower I stand’ (reading also מִצְפֵּה—with *çērē*), but the evidence for ‘Ariel’ seems to me much too slight.

W. Emery Barnes.

ON EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLI.

In the first number of the Journal of Theological Studies Mr. C. H. Turner published a note on Eusebius of Vercelli, in which he raised two questions. (i) Was this Eusebius the author of the Seven Books on the Trinity, which have been handed down to us under the name of Vigilius of Thapsus? (ii) Could he have been the author of the *Quicumque uult*?

In the following note I will try to carry the discussion a stage further, and to prove (i) that Eusebius of Vercelli was most probably the author of this work of pseudo-Vigilius; (ii) that there are strong reasons against the supposition that the author of these Books on the Trinity could also have written the Creed. At the same time I am willing to admit that the theory of Eusebian authorship throws new light on the history of the theological terms used in the Creed.

i. In a MS of Canons in the Vatican Library (*Cod. Vatic.* 1319) Mr. Turner found some portions (Books I, II, VI, VII) of the work of pseudo-Vigilius *de Trinitate*. The name *Sancti Eusebii* is found between Books II and VI, and is given at the beginning of the volume as the name of the author.

This most interesting fact had also been noted by Dom G. Morin, O.S.B., who has published a full description of the MS[1]. Neither Mr. Turner nor Dom Morin sees any difficulty in accepting this theory of the authorship of the Seven Books, which are without doubt a complete whole, and are distinguished by many features of style from the true writings of Vigilius of Thapsus.

Criticism has not yet finished its work of sifting the many MSS of Vigilius. An excellent beginning, however, has been made by Lic. Dr. Gerhard Ficker[2], who has called attention to two other MSS, which quote these Seven Books as the work of St. Athanasius 'On the Unity of the Godhead.' They are *Cod. Ambros.* O. 210 *sup.* of the seventh century, which is unfortunately defective, and *Cod. Berolin.* 1671 (*olim* Phillipps 78) of the ninth century, in which Book XII follows as another work of St. Athanasius 'On the Trinity.'

The internal evidence of Books I–VII reveals marked characteristics of style and the use of special phrases which are lacking in the other books, such as—*uniter*, *rogo* (at beginning of a sentence), *ac per hoc*, *stilum* (*luminis*, *scripturae*), *plenitudo.*

I cannot pause to discuss them. But it remains to point out that there are traces of a longer recension which included Book VIII, with which Books IX and XII are usually grouped, whereas Books X, XI are grouped with the short recension. Book IX is a formulary of faith, commonly called the 'Faith of the Romans,' which has been traced to the pen of Phoebadius of Agen. Book X is largely made up of quotations from Niceta of Remesiana and Leporius of Trèves. Book XI has quotations from Pope Leo's Letter to Flavian. Book XII is probably a genuine work of St. Athanasius extant only in this Latin version. Dr. Ficker does not think that the short recension can claim to be considered the original form, since Book VI is found by itself and has had an independent history[3].

The only writings of Eusebius of Vercelli, which have come down to us, are three letters, two of which are very short, and the third historical rather than dogmatic. They agree with the Books on the Trinity in calling the Arians *ariomanitae*, and in reprobation of the conduct of Hosius. But these thoughts were commonplaces in the fourth century, and by themselves prove nothing.

From a careful study of the internal evidence Dom Morin concludes that the Books on the Trinity must have been written in the north of Italy during the second half of the fourth century.

---

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, Jan. 1898.

[2] *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus*, Leipzig, 1897.

[3] Ficker, p. 67, shows that it is quoted as an independent work in *Cod. Veron.* lix 57, of the eighth [rather of the seventh, if not even of the sixth] century. To this I can add *Cod. Lat. Monacensis* 5508 *saec.* ix, in which it follows the *Commonitorium* sent by Bishops Lupus and Euphronius to Bishop Talasius, with the title *Incipit epistola eiusdem: Fides Niceni Concilij.* I owe this information to the kindness of Dr. von Laubmann.

There is a reference to the Council of Rimini which was held in 359. There are many references to the erroneous doctrine of the Manicheans, but none to the heresy of Priscillian, which spread widely from Spain after 380. The quotations from the Gospels show that the author used one of the so-called 'European' texts, which were current in the fourth century, and of which *Codex Vercellensis* is a specimen. This celebrated MS of the Latin Gospels, magnificently bound in silver, is treasured in the Cathedral Library at Vercelli, and contains the reputed autograph of Eusebius.

In Books III and IX two otherwise unknown heretics are quoted as Mascellio Montensis and Potentinus Urbicus. The term *Montensis* was employed to designate members of the Donatist community in Rome, and the term *Urbicus* was often synonymous with *Romanus* in fourth-century writings. The author was therefore intimately acquainted with the course of ecclesiastical affairs at Rome. And with this fact it is most interesting to connect a passage in a book of *Questions on the Old and New Testaments*, which was written by a Roman contemporary of Pope Damasus (A.D. 366–384)[1]. In Question cxxv the author refutes a certain Eusebius, an excellent writer, who had been dead some years. He represents Eusebius as teaching that the Holy Spirit did not know the mystery of the Nativity of our Lord, though he taught that He is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. The latter part of the statement exactly corresponds to the teaching of the Books on the Trinity. And the reference appears to me to clinch the argument for the Eusebian authorship recorded by the Vatican MS.

There is yet another proof that a Eusebius of this period possessed a wide reputation. Vigilius of Thapsus, in his genuine work against Eutyches (ii 10), mentions among writers on the Incarnation whom he praises as Apostolic men, Hilary, Eusebius, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome. It is obvious that this notice fits in with the known facts about Eusebius of Vercelli, who as the probable author of the Books on the Trinity becomes an important personage in Church History.

[Since this Note was written Dom Morin has published an article in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* (No. 2, 1900), in which he suggests that the author of the *de Trinitate* was not Eusebius after all, but Gregory of Elvira. In the new *Tractatus Origenis*, recently published by Mgr. P. Batiffol, he found the phrase *Hieremias receptissi-*

---

[1] In an article in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature relig.*, 1899, iv No. 2, Dom Morin has shown that the author of these Questions, and of the celebrated commentary on St. Paul's Epistles known as 'the Ambrosiaster,' was probably one Isaac, a converted Jew. (JOURNAL OF THEOL. STUDIES, i p. 154; *Expositor*, November, 1899.)

mus prophetarum, which is used in the *de Trinitate*, and in the treatise *de Fide* published among the works of St. Ambrose[1]. Further study revealed a series of other phrases which are common to the three works.

It is quite certain that the *de Fide* was attributed to a Bishop Gregory as early as the fifth century[2]. St. Jerome informs us that Gregory, Bishop of Elvira, 'writing even to extreme old age, composed various treatises in mediocre language, and an eloquent work *On Faith*[3].' This description suits the *de Fide* and the sermons attributed to Origen. We may congratulate Dom Morin on another literary discovery, which seems likely to justify itself better than the suggestion made by Dr. C. Weyman that the sermons were written by Novatian[4]. They show acquaintance with fourth-century controversies.

But Dom Morin makes no attempt to answer his own arguments for assigning an Italian origin to the *de Trinitate*.

i. There is the acquaintance of the author with ecclesiastical affairs in Rome, which we should expect Eusebius to show, since St. Jerome records the fact that he had been a *Lector* in Rome[5].

ii. There is the evidence of Scriptural quotations. There are a certain number of common quotations, which reveal variant readings and tend to prove that the *de Trinitate* is not from the same author as the *de Fide* and the *Tractatus*.

The appearance of the many common phrases in the *de Trinitate*, and in these works, which we agree to attribute to Gregory, may be explained in part as Dom Morin himself explains the similarity in style between them and a treatise of Phoebadius of Agen against the Arians. They were written at the same period, and under similar conditions. But there is no reason why we should not further assume that Gregory quoted the *de Trinitate* as freely as he appears to have quoted St. Hilary of Poictiers. In this connexion we may note that the *de Fide* is found in two editions, and that two out of the three important passages in which its language is plainly dependent on the *de Trinitate* are found in the prologue and epilogue of the second edition only. Further investigation of all these points is required, and I have only attempted to summarize Dom Morin's argument in order to show why I still prefer to regard Eusebius as the probable author of the *de Trinitate*.]

ii. We must now turn to consider what bearing these considerations have on the history of the *Quicumque uult*.

Mr. Turner calls attention to a manuscript of the Irish Book of Hymns, which assigns to Eusebius part-authorship of the Creed. Its interest is increased by the fact that this Irish Book preserves the tradition that the *Te Deum* was written by a Niceta, which is probably a true record of the authorship. If it is right in the one case, may it not be right in the other? The passage is as follows: 'The synod of Nicaea made this Catholic faith: three bishops of them alone made it, viz. Eusebius and Dionysius *et nomen tertii nescimus*,' &c. The two bishops named are evidently Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan, who were exiled by Constantius about A.D. 355–356 because they would not condemn St. Athanasius.

---

[1] Migne xvii col. 549.

[2] It was quoted by St. Augustine, *Ep.* 148, as the work of *Gregorius sanctus episcopus orientalis*.

[3] *de uir. ill.* cv.

[4] *Archiv f. lat. Lexikogr.* xi 467.

[5] *de uir. ill.* xcvi.

The date of the Irish Book of Hymns is the eleventh century, and the tradition reappeared in the fourteenth century. Cardinal Bona, writing on *Divine Psalmody* (*c.* 16, § 18), quoted a MS History of Piedmont by one Gulielmus Baldesanus, preserved in the Library of the Duke of Savoy at Turin, which asserted that Eusebius of Vercelli had helped Athanasius to write the Creed, or had translated it into Latin. From Bona the statement was quoted by several writers, Bishop Jewell, Voss, Tentzel, until the argument was confuted by Waterland.

To the quotation from the Irish Book of Hymns, which he knew through Ussher, Waterland replied that the story of combined authorship had been probably invented to explain why the Creed of St. Athanasius, the third unknown, was written in Latin. And he referred to a passage in which St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 63), writing to the Church of Vercelli after the death of Eusebius, referred in eulogistic terms both to Eusebius and Dionysius as suffering for the faith, and said of Eusebius that 'he raised the standard of confession.' St. Ambrose evidently meant confession of Christ without reference to a form of words composed by Eusebius, but it is easy to understand how the story could grow out of his words. With regard to the history of Baldesanus, Waterland assumes that his general argument on the date of the Creed, which he assigns to the fifth century, precludes any such theory of authorship.

With due deference to Mr. Turner's arguments, I must take my stand by Waterland. I cannot grant to Mr. Turner that the form of Apollinarian heresy which is condemned in the *Quicumque* had even arisen in the year A.D. 362 when Eusebius supported Athanasius at the Council of Alexandria. It is true that the Letter which was sent by the Council to the Church of Antioch laid stress on the teaching that the Saviour had a soul, as if afraid of the tendency which afterwards developed into heresy. But Apollinaris himself was represented by his legates at the Council and signed the letter, which cannot be said to have condemned him. As to the quotation from Rufinus (*H. E.* x 29), in which he 'falls almost into the very language of the *Quicumque*' when 'describing the confession of this synod,' I would suggest that the coincidence of phrases is not surprising. It was a commonplace of theological language at the end of the fourth century to say that the Holy Spirit was of the same substance with the Father and the Son, and the teaching that 'nothing in the Trinity is to be called greater or less' is found in Origen (*de Princ.* i 7), from whom Rufinus had probably learnt his phrases[1].

I am willing to grant that the case against Apollinarianism is strongly stated in the (Eusebian?) Books on the Trinity, but I think that the evidence of St. Ambrose is decisive against the theory that Eusebius reproduced the theology of Athanasius in the form of the Athanasian Creed. There is not only the letter to the Church of Vercelli to be considered. There are all the passages in which, as Waterland[2] shows so clearly, St. Ambrose shrinks from expressing the Divine Unity by a singular adjective, *unus est Deus sanctus* (*de S.S.* iii 16), whereas St. Augustine in his fifth Book of the Trinity 'enlarges in justification of this rule of expression, and is full and copious upon it.'

The (Eusebian?) Books on the Trinity show a form of teaching which is much more akin to St. Ambrose than to St. Augustine. The writer has grasped the thought of the main antithesis, one God in Trinity, but does not seek to illustrate it as in the Creed it is illustrated by subordinate antitheses.

Bk. I, p. 205[3]: Uides per singulas significationes unitum nomen deitatis ter indicatum: hoc est, Deus, Deus, et Deus: non tamen Deos. Bk. III, p. 240: Sine hoc tale dictum referas, quemadmodum Deus est Pater, sic Deus est et Filius, sic Deus est et Spiritus sanctus.

With these we may compare an interesting passage (Bk. I, p. 207), based on the famous verse about the heavenly witnesses, which has been interpolated in 1 John v 7, in which he pleads that the Father is God and Lord and Spirit, the Son is God and Lord and Spirit, and the Spirit, the Paraclete, is God and Lord and Spirit. Here again we miss the guarding clause of the *Quicumque*—'*et tamen non tres Dii*,' &c.

I may bring forward other arguments from the internal evidence of these Books, which appear to me to prove that their author could not have written the *Quicumque*.

There is nothing nearer to the teaching of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son than the statement that He proceeds 'from the united substance' (of the Trinity) at the end of Book VII. Here again Augustine, if not an intermediary, shows the progress in thought which the next generation attained in speculation on this profound mystery, progress which is recorded in the *Quicumque* (cl. 22).

---

[1] Rufinus writes: 'nec quicquam prorsus in Trinitate aut creatum aut inferius posteriusue diceretur.' Cf. a close parallel in the Creed of Pelagius (Hahn ^{3}, p. 289).

[2] P. 141 f.

[3] My references are to the pages in Chifflet's edition of Vigilius.

We may note that the phrase *Deus et homo* occurs more than once in connexion with the attribute *uerus*. This is not the special line of the Creed, which emphasizes rather the *perfectness* of the Godhead and Manhood in Christ. Such phraseology, though probably derived from St. Athanasius (*c. Apollin.* i 16) and strongly urged against Apollinarianism by the Synod which met under Damasus in Rome *c.* 369, does not recur in the Eusebian books[1] (except in a quotation in Book VI, p. 254).

Again, Eusebius speaks of the Lord's assumption of *a man* not *manhood* (as in the Creed), using both *suscipere* and *assumere*.

The contrast to the *Quicumque* is more marked because the author has a very interesting parallel to cl. 31 in his use of the phrase *secundum diuinitatem*, which he follows up with *secundum carnem* (p. 227). He teaches clearly that the Son of God as God and Man is one Christ, but does not dream of the necessity of guarding against the thought of a 'conversion of the Godhead in flesh.'

From these considerations it appears that this work of Eusebius, or some other Italian author of the fourth century, becomes a most important witness to the gradual formation of theological language during the period between Hilary and Ambrose, which is precisely the position which Vigilius of Thapsus assigned to a Eusebius. With the greatest interest we trace his free use of the term *persona* (= ὑπόστασις) on the lines laid down by St. Hilary and with the meaning 'one who acts.' St. Augustine appears to shrink from the use of that term because of the legal associations, which, in the minds of those who were familiar with law, tended to reduce its meaning to an abstraction, 'the possessing of property, theoretical ownership.'

We note also how clearly he guards the truth that Christ is One Person in two natures half a century before the rise of Nestorianism. This adds a very strong argument to our armoury against writers who claim that the *Quicumque* must have been written after the condemnation of Nestorius simply because of the parallel insistence on the doctrine of the Unity of the Lord's Person. What could be plainer than the following passage (Bk. III, p. 233)?—

'Nonne una est persona Filii Dei, et duplex est eius significatio, Deus et homo? Nonne unus est Filius, qui secundum carnem primogenitus filius nuncupatur ex mortuis homo, sicut scriptum est; *Qui est primogenitus ex mortuis*. Itaque crede mihi, qui legis hanc scripturae meae fidei professionem, quia multi de hac tractauerunt, sed non intelligentes errauerunt: qui dum personam pro causa discernunt, duos filios in confessione introduxerunt: qui debuerant causam passionis hominis a diuinitate discernere, et non personam; dum unus sit Filius cuius est persona. Sed duplex naturae significatio est, dum unigenitus a Deo Patre Deus sit, et primogenitus a mortuis homo sit: dum Deus uerus, et homo uerus sit; et cum Deus sit, et secum assumptus sit.'

---

[1] St. Augustine (*Serm.* 238) writes: 'aduersus Apollinarem perfectam hominis in Christo defendimus ueritatem,' connecting the thoughts of truth and perfectness.

The mention of his profession of faith as a 'scriptura' suggests at this point a reply to Dr. Ficker, who noticed the close similarity between the language of these Books on the Trinity and the *Quicumque*, but is unfair to both documents when he asserts that their authors claim for them a position equal to the Scriptures on pain of eternal judgement[1]. This is the sort of thing which is often said against the Creed without reason, since the only really damnatory clause is that which refers to moral conduct under the heading of good or evil works without reference to intellectual opinions. But it is a truism to say that faith influences conduct, and therefore without loyalty to the Catholic Faith no man can be safe. The Creed is not propounded as an exhaustive exposition of the Catholic Faith, only as a Manual of its teaching. As for the Books on the Trinity the author draws the plainest possible distinction between his treatise and the Holy Scriptures, upon which he pleads that it is founded, but with which he does not presume to compare it. It is true that he bestows very free maledictions on many forms of heresy, but behind the bitterness of a character perhaps soured by persecution we find the lineaments of a very humble and devout mind. He demands from his reader that he should not look for superfluous words, but for words said strictly, amply, nay rather spiritually, and with utmost care, to be compared with the style of Holy Scripture and fairly weighed. Every one must agree as to the ring of sincerity in these words (Bk. III, p. 219): 'Because, O God, I have thought concerning Thee more than I have expressed clearly: since concerning Thee, O God, we must believe and not define.'

More will no doubt be written about this interesting treatise, which need no longer be neglected because of the uncertainty about its date. We shall have the advantage of comparing with it the genuine works of Vigilius of Thapsus, who seems to have held its author in so high repute. Altogether, a new chapter in its history has been opened out.

A. E. BURN.

---

[1] In three of the passages quoted by Dr. Ficker (p. 70) the reading is admittedly doubtful, so that they ought not to be quoted to the prejudice of the author without verification. The fourth (Bk. VI, p. 254) is as follows: 'Eris tu ipse reus in die iudicii, cum huius scripturae chirographum ante tribunal Christi in testimonium tibi fuerit recitatum.' We have only to compare this passage with the words in Bk. I (p. 202) about *sacrae Scripturae*, and *euangelicae Scripturae*, to make sure that he did not put his writing on a level with the Scriptures, though his determination to found his witness against error upon them gives him confidence in making this appeal from the judgement of men to the judgement of the Great Day.

REVIEWS

PAGANISM AND THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire. By SAMUEL DILL, M.A., Professor of Greek in Queen's College, Belfast. (London, 1898 [2nd Edit. 1899].)

THE Fall of the Empire in the West is a neglected subject. The classical scholar shrinks from a repulsive literature, the ecclesiastical historian cares only for his controversies, and even the student of history prefers a later period. Yet the story is a very modern one, for the evils which ruined the Empire are rife in modern Europe. We see the same unsettlement of religion, the same increasing contrast and antagonism of rich and poor, the same growing burden of taxation and militarism, the same hatreds of nations, the same tendency to stereotype education in a barren routine, the same impotence of governments to cure the evils caused by superficial Christianity and selfish greed in all classes. No period of history is more full of warning to ourselves, for if these things get beyond control, neither science, nor culture, nor nominal Christianity, will save civilization from a second overthrow.

So much the more heartily we welcome (and that in a second edition) Professor Dill's masterly analysis of the Empire of the West in its last decay. Its attractive style is the least of its merits. He begins by asking why heathenism was able so long to delay the final triumph of the Gospel. The answer is, that Greece had cast her spell even on the Christians, so that their ways of thinking differed little from the heathen. Only the monks were revolutionists. Hence the strange tolerance of the age. Ambrose and the heathen Symmachus, Augustine and the astrologer Lampadius, are on the best of terms, and the old heathen pontiff Albinus listens graciously to his little granddaughter singing hymns to Christ.

Our author next traces the pagan reactions of Eugenius and Attalus (just baptized to please the Goths), the struggles of the Church against the obscenities of the stage and the bestialities of the amphitheatre, and the shock of the sack of Rome by Alaric. Then he comes to his estimate of paganism itself, pointing out that it worshipped Mithras now rather than Jupiter, and showing how greatly it had gained in moral force since the rise of Neo-Platonism.

Next comes a careful estimate of the heathen senatorial aristocracy. In this he agrees generally with Fustel de Coulanges, and differs widely from popular ideas. He rightly prefers the incidental revelations of Symmachus and Macrobius to the ascetic tirades of Jerome and Salvian. Slave-holders are not likely to be models of virtue: but there are no signs of widespread and outrageous immorality; the dinner parties, for instance, are much more decent than in classical times. They were commonly refined and cultured gentlemen, fond of country life, and even fonder of their literary elegances. If the Empire shut them out from war, they were not therefore imbeciles or cowards—witness Tonantius Ferreolus, or the defence of Auvergne by Ecdicius. This is worked out in successive chapters on Symmachus the senator and administrator, Ausonius the poet and professor, and Sidonius the poet turned bishop. There is a real charge against these aristocrats, as we shall see; but it is not the popular one of utter vileness.

The next part is a searching analysis of the government. Its legislation is full of earnest purpose and general humanity. The emperors were absolute and commonly well-disposed, had good advisers, and quite recognized the evils which oppressed the State. Law after law strikes straight at them with fierce energy, and sometimes even delivers gross offenders to 'the avenging flames'; and there was no want of honest governors who did the best they could. But the emperor had lost control of the machine. The *curiales* had been crushed by taxation; the smaller landowners had been squeezed out by the stress of the times; there remained the senators and the officials, and their passive resistance made every reform nugatory. The officials ran riot in peculation and malversation, and the great landowners either corrupted them or evaded inconvenient laws. Even in the great crisis of the invasion of Radagaisus, when the very slaves were called to arms for the first time since Cannae, the senators defrauded the Empire of recruits, and sheltered deserters wholesale.

But why was not the impending fall of the Empire more clearly recognized? Because the invasions were nothing new. They had always been repulsed, and were repulsed still; and if the barbarians came in, they came in as servants and allies of Rome. They were proud to serve her, and often reached her highest dignities. Richomer and Bauto moved among the Roman nobles as their equals, and the Empress Eudoxia was Bauto's daughter. So there seemed but little change. The shock indeed of the sack of Rome was terrible; but in a few years it was forgotten. Orosius could say that the world was only 'troubled with fleas.' In the next generation Orientius and Salvian sing another song—that devastation had searched out all the corners of the land: yet when we get a fair view of Gaul again from Sidonius, we do not find things nearly so bad as we should expect. There was something even in the 'Gothic peace' which had replaced the Roman.

There remains for examination the culture of the age, and this was in a hopeless state. The old pagan education was still dominant—treason to the Muses was treason to civilization—but it was rapidly decaying even in Gaul. The grammarian indeed had to expound questions of etymology, of history, of antiquities, of criticism in his author: but what might have been a solid foundation was turned into a literary drill; a perfunctory preparation for the serious work of the rhetorician. And that serious work was utter trifling. Form was everything, matter nothing. So literature is full of nothing but servility, mutual admiration, strange twists of language, and fantastic mythology. Progress was impossible. Just as faith in Rome killed faith in mankind, so trust in words killed truth of thought. The leaders of society were heathen literary men with a slight varnish of Christianity, so that their thoughts moved in the past; and when that past was exhausted, they had no outlook to the future. Culture like that was doomed.

This is the outline which Professor Dill has worked out with admirable thoroughness. He covers the ground much better than Boissier in his charming *Fin du Paganisme,* while he is not less careful of detail and accuracy than Fustel de Coulanges, and defends fewer questionable positions. He has laid under contribution most of the writers of the time, and his use of the *Codex Theodosianus* in particular deserves high praise. Yet perhaps he has not made all that he might have made of Christianity, even on so secular a subject as Roman society. He might, for instance, have clinched more than one of his points by comparing Claudian's philosophy of history with that of Prudentius, or the Christian conception of worship and priesthood with the heathen. Indeed, he has neglected Claudian, though Claudian hardly yields to Virgil in his sense of the grandeur of Rome. Again, he treats Christianity too much as a solid unit, without taking account enough of its variant forms of thought. Even the illiterate fanaticism of the monks had affinity enough to some kinds of heathenism. In short, he has not clearly enough borne in mind that Christianity and heathenism were more mixed up together, and influenced each other in that age more freely than they ever did before or since, so that neither of them can be rightly understood without taking full account of the other. But enough of criticism. The book is already much the best we have on the subject; and we may hope that Professor Dill may reach a third edition to make it better still.

H. M. Gwatkin.

LOMBARDS, POPES, AND FRANKS.

Italy and her Invaders. Vols. vii and viii. By T. HODGKIN, D.C.L. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.)

THE two volumes which we now have before us bring Mr. Hodgkin's great work—a labour of twenty years, since its first volume appeared in 1880—to a satisfactory conclusion. He has determined to stop short at the Frankish conquest, which so unhappily linked the history of Italy to that of the 'Holy Roman Empire' for the rest of the Middle Ages. The last of the great barbarian invasions, the Moorish attack in the ninth and tenth centuries—which for a moment set up a sultanate in Apulia and Calabria, and seemed likely to drag southern Italy out of the pale of Christendom—he has resolved to leave untouched, since the valour of Lewis II and Berengar ultimately averted the peril that for thirty years appeared so menacing.

The story of the years 744–774, which is comprised in the first of these two volumes, includes the turning-point in the history of Italy—the crisis which decided that the peninsula was not to settle down into a national kingdom ruled from Pavia (or perhaps from Rome), but was to lose its autonomy and be hopelessly bound up with the good and evil fortune of the house of the Karlings. The ruin of the Lombards starts at the moment of their greatest triumph: in 751 their energetic king Aistulf drove out the Byzantines from Ravenna, and so, unlike his predecessors, was undisputed monarch over the whole of Northern and North-central Italy. In 752 he started out to complete his triumph by the conquest of Rome, where, under the nominal overlordship of Constantinople, the popes had for the last two generations exercised the real sovereign power. Since the Iconoclastic controversy had sundered East and West, the supremacy of the Leo or Constantine who reigned on the Bosphorus was acknowledged by nothing more than the fact that Roman state documents were still dated by his regnal years. Accordingly it was not from his heretical and estranged suzerain that Pope Stephen II sought help against the approaching Lombards, but from Pippin the Frank, who had but just superseded as king the last of the effete Merovingians. All the future woes of Italy come from Stephen's disastrously successful journey to the Frankish court, during which he sought and enlisted the protection of Pippin. Frank and Lombard had been good friends of late years, and Charles Martel had definitely refused to break his alliance with the predecessor of Aistulf in response to a papal summons. But Pippin had a debt to pay to the papacy: he had received its sanction for his usurpation of the Frankish throne, and in return came over the Alps to crush the hosts of Aistulf, to compel him to evacuate his late conquests, and to bestow the cities lately torn from the Greek on the 'successor of St. Peter.' The Lombard monarchy had still a few years to live, but from the moment when Pippin made his first triumphant descent into the valley of the Po, it was practically moribund. Aistulf and Desiderius, who followed Aistulf upon the throne of Pavia, seem to have been perfectly conscious of the fact: they never once dared to meet the Franks in equal battle on the open plain. They fought by chicane and elusive negotiations; when attacked they tried to hold the Alpine passes, but the moment that these defiles were forced fled again and again, to take shelter behind the strong walls of their capital. Evidently they regarded the idea of standing up to the overwhelming numbers of the Frankish hosts as hopeless. Authari, and other Lombard kings of an earlier generation, had made a far sterner resistance against the Merovingians, when last the western enemy had come over the passes, and the feebleness of Aistulf's defence is rather surprising. It is true that Pippin and Charles the Great were men of a very different calibre from the early Merovingians, and that the armies which they levied and the empire which they ruled were far more formidable. Nevertheless, the Lombards should have made a better fight: Mr. Hodgkin suggests various reasons for their collapse. Aistulf and Desiderius, though not cowards, were both too shifty and intriguing to stand out as heroic figures. The 'centrifugal tendency' of Lombard feudalism did much to weaken them; yet we cannot see that the local dukes were a whit less trustworthy in 760 than when Authari had successfully driven back the Franks in 590. The theory that the Lombards had fallen into weakness and effeminacy and 'lost some of their ancient manhood' (vii p. 385), does not seem borne out by the subsequent history of the race. On the whole, the most important factor in their fall was probably their reverence for the Church. Since their conversion to orthodoxy in the previous century the Lombards, kings and people alike, had come very much under the influence of Rome; though the Pope was their inevitable political enemy, he was at the same time their spiritual father. Their history is full of kings and dukes who, like their Anglo-Saxon contemporaries in our own island, resigned their power and took the cowl. They were among the most liberal founders of churches and monasteries in Western Europe, and their laws are full of clauses dealing with religion. In spite of this they were perpetually coming under the papal ban; since the pontiffs had begun to regard themselves as the legitimate heirs of the imperial dominions in Italy, any Lombard advance against imperial territory was treated as an attack on the Church. The hatred of the Lombard race shown by the letters of the eighth-century Popes is almost grotesquely malignant: their pious and orthodox kings are 'unspeakable,' 'devilish,' 'vile,' 'perfidious.' We are ashamed for the writers when we count up how many times the phrase 'foetidissima gens Langobardorum' occurs in Roman documents. The papal biographer thinks it becoming to ascribe the death of the wise, virtuous, and patriotic king Liutprand to the fervent prayers of Pope Zacharias. Paul I considered the Lombard such fair game for the most shameless treachery, that he indited at the same moment the two letters printed on pp. 258–9 of vol. vii, while King Desiderius was visiting him at Rome to pay his devotions at the tombs of the Apostles. The first, intended for the eye of Lombard ambassadors, speaks of the king as 'his most excellent, peaceful, and humble son.' The second, destined for the private direction of Pippin the Frank, states that the first is meaningless; 'no heed is to be paid to its contents,' for Desiderius is really 'a shuffling trickster, impious, cruel, and nefarious.' It was not really religious hatred which spoke through the venomous abuse of successive popes, but race-hatred. The Lombards were as orthodox as the Franks, and decidedly better livers; but they were conquering Teutons, detested by the Romans whom they had half subdued. The dread of the day when a Lombard king should sit on the Palatine, and the Lateran should become the second instead of the chief of Roman palaces, was the true cause of the never-ending flow of papal invectives. Pippin and Charles listened to the charmer; they launched their hosts across the Alps; and the one fair chance of unity which Italy had seen since the fall of the Ostrogoths came to an end. For just a thousand years the peninsula had to deplore the success of Pope Stephen's impassioned appeals to the stranger.

Mr. Hodgkin's eighth volume tells how Charles the Great dealt with conquered Italy. On the whole the lot of the Lombards was not so hard as might have been expected. It was an absolute political necessity for him to remove the greater part of the local dukes and to replace them by Franks. But the official nobility suffered far more than any other part of the nation. There was no attempt to thrust Frankish institutions wholesale upon the peninsula. Charles' 'Lombard Capitularies' prove that he was prepared to give Italy special legislation, and by crowning his third son as its king he showed that he intended it to have a certain local autonomy. But he had fatally linked it to the alien realms beyond the Alps, and he had given the papacy the first firm basis for its territorial sovereignty, even though he may not have assented to the preposterous 'Donation of Constantine,' which Pope Hadrian tried to foist upon him. Moreover, he had allowed Leo III to place the imperial diadem on his head, and thereby (to the future ruin of his kindred and his successors) bound up for ever the ideas of the papal assent and the imperial coronation.

C. Oman.

HILGENFELD'S EDITION OF THE ACTS.

Acta Apostolorum Graece et Latine secundum antiquissimos testes edidit, Actus Apostolorum extra canonem receptum et Adnotationes ad textum et argumentum Actuum Apostolorum addidit, Adolfus Hilgenfeld (Berolini, MDCCCXCIX).

An enormous amount has been written in recent years on the subject of the text of the Acts of the Apostles, the particular problem which so many scholars have set themselves to solve being that of the origin of the so-called 'Western' text. And the fullest discussion of this difficult question is greatly to be desired; for, while it is not probable that the theory of any one writer will be found to satisfy all the conditions, one may fairly hope that each is contributing his share towards the final working out of the solution. Among the more recent additions to this mass of literature is the present work of Prof. Hilgenfeld, supplemented by a 'Nachwort' in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* for July, 1899. The book is divided into five parts—Dr. Hilgenfeld himself describes it as a 'Pentateuch'; the first contains the result of his critical examination of the text, the remainder illustrative or explanatory matter. They are as follows: I. Πράξεις ’Αποστόλων cum apparatu critico; II. Actus Apostolorum Latine; III. Actus Apostolorum extra canonem receptum; IV. Adnotationes ad textum Actuum Apostolorum; V. Adnotationes ad argumentum Actuum Apostolorum. There are also Prolegomena, in which a short account is given of the various manuscripts and versions referred to in the apparatus criticus; and sundry appendices, which contain the singular readings of the Athos Codex given by von der Goltz[1], a list of the express quotations from the Old Testament in the Acts, Addenda et Corrigenda, and, finally, 'Codicum scribendi vitia vel proprietates'—a very brief and incomplete list of peculiarities or errors in writing in various Greek MSS, attention being paid specially to D and 137. Here too may be mentioned the 'Nachwort,' which, besides giving further Addenda et Corrigenda, criticizes in detail two 'Abhandlungen' by Harnack[2], which aim at proving the secondary character of the text of D in xi 27, 28, and xv 20, 29. As my main object is to discuss some of the fresh matter which Dr. Hilgenfeld has contributed towards the study of the textual criticism of the Acts, I will only briefly describe the two divisions of the book which have no relation to this subject.

Section III contains not, as might be supposed from the title,

---

[1] *Eine text-kritische Arbeit des X. bezw. VI. Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig, 1899, p. 16 f.

[2] Published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kön. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* for 1899, xvii and xi.

Apocryphal Acts, but extracts from various early writers, which supplement the narrative of the Canonical Acts with details—apocryphal or otherwise—as to the history of the early Church and the lives and teaching of the Apostles. Prof. Hilgenfeld tells us he has made it a rule to admit nothing by any writer later than Clement of Alexandria; but there are a few exceptions—notably the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, the extracts from which occupy more than a third of the available space. The whole forms a useful collection of early traditions.

Section V is the only part of the book that deals with the 'higher' criticism of the Acts, and may be regarded as a supplement to a long series of articles by the same author, entitled 'Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihren Quellenschriften untersucht,' in his *Zeitschrift* for 1895, 1896. In these Prof. Hilgenfeld sought to prove that the book of the Acts of the Apostles in its present form was composed by the 'Auctor ad Theophilum' out of three treatises lying ready to his hand, viz. A. πράξεις Πέτρου, consisting of chapters i–v (in the main) with xii 1–23 and some other fragments—the work of a Judaizing Christian; B. πράξεις τῶν ἑπτά, including most of chapters vi–viii, composed by a Christian Hellenist; and C. πράξεις Παύλου, the work of Luke the companion of St. Paul, comprising (with due allowance for redactorial activity) the rest of the book. Now, however, he finds himself forced to admit that Luke himself was the 'Auctor ad Theophilum.' And he holds that Luke's original work—πράξεις Παύλου—was enlarged by some unknown redactor, who added A and B and made a number of minor alterations, into our present πράξεις ἀποστόλων. This of course involves the theory that the first two verses of chapter i belong to the πράξεις Παύλου, and that the redactor has displaced and mutilated Luke's original preface to make it fit the enlarged work. In the notes on the subject-matter of the Acts which compose Section V, Prof. Hilgenfeld endeavours to defend his new position in detail, and also explains what fragments are to be referred to the redactor himself.

Before describing and considering more fully the remainder of the book, I cannot but express my regret that it should bear so many traces of hasty compilation or publication—the author himself tells us that it was lack of time that prevented him from providing, as he had intended, lists of the principal Greek and Latin words. The mistakes are doubtless not all due to Dr. Hilgenfeld himself, for he mentions that owing to the smallness of his writing the Greek text and the apparatus criticus had to be copied out for the press by friends, and it is obvious how many errors might be introduced in this way. But besides numerous misprints, some of which are corrected in the Addenda and Nachwort, there are also a few serious blunders. Thus in the Prolegomena the printed editions of the Sahidic and Bohairic Versions are confused, and the references to the important quotations from Augustine, which provide an African Latin version of i 1–ii 13, are given entirely wrongly. In the apparatus criticus on several occasions one MS is cited as supporting two different readings, and sometimes the readings themselves—even in the case of well-known authorities—are wrongly quoted.

In both the Preface and the Prolegomena, Dr. Hilgenfeld tells us that he prefers the 'Western' text, represented pre-eminently by Codex Bezae. But he does not believe with Blass that St. Luke published two editions of the Acts. He follows, independently, the older view of Bornemann that the D text is the only original one. The text to which ℵ B are the principal witnesses (which he calls the new Textus Receptus—to distinguish it from the Elzevir text to which that appellation is usually given) he believes to owe its origin to the labours of Alexandrine grammarians.

A few points in the Prolegomena require attention. On p. ix the minuscule 180 (= 431 Evv., 238 Paul) is said to have perished at the siege of Strassburg in 1870. It may be as well to call attention to the fact (for the knowledge of which I am indebted to Prof. Nestle [1]) that the MS in question is still in existence and uninjured. This is also recorded (as Prof. Nestle pointed out to me) in the Addenda to Dr. Gregory's Prolegomena (p. 1308). The MS has always been in the library of the Catholic Seminary at Strassburg, since it left the Jesuit College at Molsheim [2], and thus escaped destruction when the University library was burnt down. By the kindness of the librarian I was able in 1898 to collate it for the Acts and to photograph two pages. It is a beautiful little book, measuring only 13½ x 10 centimetres. The writing, which is small and regular, occupies a space of about 9½ x 6½ centimetres. The number of lines on a page varies in different parts, but in the Acts is usually twenty-eight. All the books of the New Testament are present except the Apocalypse; there is some prefatory matter, and lists of *κεφάλαια* and *ὑποθέσεις* are attached to nearly all the books. The date, Mr. F. G. Kenyon kindly informs me, must be circa 1200. The collation of the text given by Scholz (from Arendt), and adopted by Tischendorf, is generally correct, though a few important readings are omitted. The text itself is curiously mixed—there are notable Western readings, and, on the other hand, remarkable coincidences with ℵ B. But it is clear from many minor readings that the MS has an intimate connexion with 137, and the group at the head of which this latter stands.

This important MS (= 176 Paul, and designated M by Prof. Hilgenfeld) is by him assigned to the earliest possible date, eleventh century, just as *vice versa* he has brought down the principal uncials to an unusually late period (B end of fifth century, ℵ sixth century): it is at least equally probable that it belongs to the thirteenth century, the date preferred by Dr. Gregory. It has hitherto only been known through the very imperfect collation of Scholz, reproduced in Tischendorf; and Dr. Hilgenfeld has conferred a great boon upon those interested in textual criticism by giving in his apparatus criticus a new and complete collation of 137 for the Acts, made by Dr. Giovanni Mercati, formerly of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, who has also revised three sheets of the proofs. It is no doubt to his having been unable to overlook the remainder that many of the inaccuracies (which are far more numerous in the latter part of the book) are due, for example the fact that, besides the one instance referred to in the Prolegomena where M is quoted for two different readings, there are at any rate ten others. By Dr. Ceriani's kindness I had an opportunity to collate the MS myself some years ago, and I now give a list of the more important readings in which the present edition requires correction. As I have not been able to verify my own collation, I have not mentioned all the passages in which it differs from that printed by Dr. Hilgenfeld, but only those where I have reason to feel quite sure of the reading. In those cases in which I have given the reading of M without any comment, it has been entirely omitted in the apparatus criticus. An asterisk denotes passages where M has been quoted for two readings, and here again I have only given the true one.

---

[1] Cf. his *Einführung in das Gr. Neue Testament*, ed. 2, 1899, p. 71.

[2] Cf. Scholz, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. 2, p. xx.

iv 11. ἡμῶν.
v 23. πρὸ θυρῶν.
vii 37. ἀναστήσει κύριος ἐκ (as 180, syr$^{\text{ph}}$), not ἀναστήσει ἐκ.
ix 7. ἀκούσαντες μέν.
19. ἐγένετο δὲ μετά, not ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ σαῦλος μετά.
21. ἐλήλυθεν.
xi 19. μόνοις, not μόνον.
22. Ἱερουσαλήμ, not Ἱεροσολύμοις.
xii 1. ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ should not be omitted.
8. εἶπεν δέ, not τε.
*25. καὶ Ἰωάνην.
xiii 4. κἀκεῖθεν.
17. διὰ τὸν λαὸν καὶ ὕψωσεν (as syr$^{\text{ph}}$, and cf. the curious reading of *g*).
19, 20. τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν ἔτεσι (not καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔτεσι) τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἔδωκε, agreeing again with syr$^{\text{ph}}$ only, except that the latter has the equivalent of ὡς ἔτεσι.
31. ἄχρι νῦν εἰσί.

*39. *παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.*
40. *ἐπέλθῃ*, not *ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.*
xiv 3. *διδόντι.*
23. *εἰς ὃν καί.*
25. *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι αὐτούς.*
xv *2. *ἵνα* (*ὅπως* in my collation) *κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν.*
4. *μεγάλως* should not be omitted.
ἀνήγγειλαν δέ (as syr^{ph}), not *τε.*
29. *πνικτῶν*, not *πνικτοῦ.*
xvii 14. *ὑπέμεινέ τε*, not *δέ.*
xviii 21, 22. M has a conflate reading here, viz. *αὐτὸς δὲ ἀν[εν]εχθεὶς ἦλθεν εἰς Καισάρειαν, καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν.*
*28. *διαλεγόμενος καί.*
xix 3. It is practically certain that M must have read *εἶπεν οὖν* as c^{scr}, syr^{ph}.
10. *τοῦ κυρίου*, not *τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.*
*27. *τοῦτο τὸ μέρος κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν.*
xx 12. *ἤγαγόν τε* (as c^{scr}), not *δέ.*
*23. *διαμεμαρτύρηται* (as c^{scr}).
31. *ἕκαστον ὑμῶν*, not *ἕκαστον.*
xxi 27. *θεασάμενοι αὐτὸν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι* (as c^{scr}).
36. *τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ὄχλου* (as c^{scr}), not *λαοῦ.*
xxii 24. *ἐκέλευσεν ὁ χιλίαρχος εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν*, i. e. om. *αὐτόν.*
26. *προσελθὼν τῷ χιλιάρχῳ ἀνήγγελε*, i. e. omit *αὐτῷ* or *λέγων* as c^{scr} syr^{ph} txt.
*29. *καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν.*
xxiii 5. *ἔφη δέ.*
21. *αὐτούς.*
24, 25. Here again M has a conflate reading, viz. *πρὸς Φίλικα τὸν ἡγεμόνα, γράψας ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον· ἐφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε ἁρπάσαντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτένωσι καὶ αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἔγκλησ[ιν ἔ]χῃ ὡς ἀργύριον εἰληφώς· ἔγραψε δὲ ἐπιστολὴν περιέχουσαν τάδε.*
xxiv 8. *ἐπί σου*, not *σε.*
*15. *ἐλπίδα δέ.*
16. *καὶ αὐτός*, not *δὲ αὐτός.*
19. *ἔδει.*
*24. *τινας ἡμέρας.*
27. *θέλλων δέ*, not *τε.*
xxv 6. *καὶ τῇ*, not *τῇ.*
xxvi 23. *καταγγελ[λ]ειν*, as also the other authorities quoted for *ἀναγγέλλειν.*

xxvii *7. *κατὰ Σαλμώνην* should be omitted.
41. *ἔμενεν*, not *ἔμεινεν*.
xxviii 1. *τότε*, as also the other authorities quoted for *τε*.
7. *ἡμέρας*, as all other MSS.
15. *εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῶν*.
23. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου*, not *ἀπὸ νόμου*.

Prof. Hilgenfeld has devoted some space in his Prolegomena to the Philoxenian Syriac version, maintaining that certain marginal readings, which have been held by Blass to be unintelligible or spurious, show that Thomas of Heraclea used a second and inferior Greek MS as well as the one so nearly akin to D. But he has rendered a real service by giving in the apparatus criticus (under the symbol Ph) a fairly complete collation of this important version, many readings of which are entirely passed over by Tischendorf. It will be remarked how frequently the symbols M Ph occur together, often with no other attestation. Dr. Hilgenfeld does not refer to this, and though the fact is sufficiently patent from the readings given by Tischendorf, no one, so far as I know, has yet called attention to it. It is impossible to discuss the matter fully here, but I may take this opportunity to point out the close connexion which exists between the text of the Philoxenian, 137, and another cursive known by the symbol c$^{\text{scr}}$. Some illustrations of this have been given incidentally above: I will add one or two more. In xv 10 these three stand alone in supporting the order *ἡμεῖς οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν*: xix 34 *φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων*, *μία* is included between asterisks in the Philoxenian, and it is actually omitted by 137 c$^{\text{scr}}$ only. In xiv 2, where D and syr$^{\text{ph mg}}$ have a long gloss, 137 c$^{\text{scr}}$ syr$^{\text{ph txt}}$ with E and one cursive vary from the ordinary text by inserting *διωγμόν* after *ἐπήγειραν*. The coincidences extend not only to the text, but also to the marginal or asterisked readings. Thus xvi 39 a long interpolation is found in D 137 syr$^{\text{ph}}$ c$^{\text{scr}*}$, but while the two latter agree word for word, D differs in one or two important points. Other members of the same group, though standing at a greater distance, are 180 and the Latin Gigas (the collation of which is another feature of the apparatus criticus), and no doubt there are more. There are also points of contact with E[1], but these are not so remarkable. I cannot help hoping that the study of this group may throw some light on the critical history of the Philoxenian version and its revision by Thomas of Heraclea.

The Greek text which Dr. Hilgenfeld prints is of course of a purely Western type. In Section IV—'Adnotationes ad Textum'—he gives his reasons (based as might be expected solely on internal evidence) for a number of the readings which he prefers, with especial reference to what has been urged on the opposite side by Dr. B. Weiss[1]. The text itself naturally nearly resembles the 'Roman form' published by Blass, the main difference being that Dr. Hilgenfeld keeps more closely to D, and pays very little attention to the Old-Latin versions. In cases such as xviii 8 and ii 12, where the Latin evidence is strongly in favour of the view that D has a conflate reading, he still holds by that MS, and defends the curious καὶ λέγοντες in the latter passage in a special note (p. 231). He even upholds (p. 253) the reading of D in xix 29 καὶ συνεχύθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις αἰσχύνης, as meaning 'confusa est civitas Aeschynes, i. e. Artemidos,' alleging in favour of this the LXX use of αἰσχύνη as an equivalent for Baal. But he deserts D occasionally where it does not support additions to be found in the group M Ph, e.g. xv 1, 6 and xvii 11. On the other hand he does not, like Blass, adopt nearly every addition to the ordinary text found in any single Latin or Greek MS. Occasionally Prof. Hilgenfeld resorts to conjectural emendation: one of the most notable instances is λευϊτῶν for λοιπῶν in v 13, and in xxvii 17 for τὸ σκεῦος he reads τι σκεῦος ἐφελκυστικόν, the equivalent of 'vas quoddam . . . quod traheret' found in *g*.

---

[1] Cf. *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. IV, p. xvii.

But the treatment of the Latin versions generally is the most unsatisfactory part of the book. The title of Section II—'Actus Apostolorum Latine'—arouses all one's curiosity, and it is the more disappointing to find that this alone contains absolutely nothing of interest or value. Any sort of Latin text accompanied by an apparatus criticus of the Latin versions would have been invaluable to students. But as it is Dr. Hilgenfeld has merely reprinted the text of *d*, filling up the gaps with *e*, and, where that also fails, with *g*. In addition he gives in a parallel column the text of the Fleury palimpsest where extant, but this is deprived of much of its value by the fact that no distinction is made in the type between what can be actually read in the MS and words added simply by conjecture. Thus certain very doubtful readings, which M. Berger would be the last person to insist upon, are printed in exactly the same manner as others in regard to which there can be no possible doubt, and even quoted in the apparatus criticus to the Greek text. Dr. Hilgenfeld has emended both his texts in a variety of minor details, and has struck out characteristic forms and spellings, relegating the original reading to the foot of the page.

One cannot but regret that, while so much labour has been expended in recent years on the Acts, so little has been done towards unravelling the tangled threads of the different forms of its text. Even if the Western text is authentic it has had a history, and is not contained in its original form in any one manuscript or version. What is needed is to determine the relation to one another of the different authorities which support it in a greater or less degree. If the Western text (and not the ℵ B group) really represents St. Luke's autograph, it goes back to a single original, and this original may with some measure of certainty be restored: but this can only be done by carefully comparing and sifting all the various documents. So long as each fresh writer is content to put out a text based mainly (if not entirely) on his own views as to what St. Luke was likely to have written, we shall make but little progress; and of this unfortunately Dr. Hilgenfeld's treatise affords fresh illustration.

---

[1] *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte.* Leipzig, 1897.

A. V. VALENTINE-RICHARDS.

DR. SWETE'S ST. MARK.

The Gospel according to St. Mark, the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices, by HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Regius Professor of Divinity and Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (Macmillan, 1898, pp. cx + 412.)

IT was a great satisfaction to many to learn that Dr. Swete had added to the great services which he has rendered to the study of Theology by producing a Commentary on the second Gospel. Although the work of Dr. Gould on St. Mark had preceded him by only a few years, it was felt by not a few of those who used the help given to them by the American scholar that there was still room for a commentary on St. Mark to supply to English-speaking students the kind of aid which was required by those who wished to keep themselves informed respecting the best results of sober criticism, without falling victims to the conjectures of a criticism which is bold rather than sober. And this is just what we find in the volume before us. As regards the text to be adopted, and also the exegesis of it, the work is both critical and constructive. There is no timid adherence to uncritical conservatism; and there are no hasty surrenders to insecure criticism. It is possible that a few will find the sobriety cold; but both the true student and the devout Christian will certainly find the book helpful. In solid learning, as well as in well-balanced judgement, it is a worthy companion of the volumes which it also resembles in external form, the Commentaries of Lightfoot on St. Paul, and of Westcott on St. John and on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In his preface Dr. Swete points out that 'the briefest of the Gospels is in some respects the fullest and the most exacting; the simplest of the books of the New Testament brings us nearest to the feet of the

Master. The interpreter of St. Mark fulfils his office so far as he assists the student to understand, and in turn to interpret to others, this primitive picture of the Incarnate Life.' Those who have made frequent use of this volume during the twenty months that have elapsed since its appearance will probably agree that the standard of fulfilment which has been reached is in this case a high one. It is worthy of Dr. Swete's reputation and of the Chair which he fills. Apparently it is to be followed (we hope at no very distant date) by a volume of notes and dissertations on 'some of the points raised by this Gospel which seemed to require fuller investigation'; and there we may expect to find what seems to be missing here. But a larger book would have been less handy; and it would not be easy to point to much that could be spared, in order to make room for an equal amount of what is absent.

The Introduction is divided into twelve sections, of which the first and longest is on the 'Personal History of St. Mark.' That he was the young man mentioned in xiv 51, 52 is thought not unlikely. The incident is evidently no part of the common tradition, but is the outcome of the writer's own recollection or special knowledge. That the John Mark of the Acts is identical with the Mark of the Pauline Epistles is regarded as 'placed beyond reasonable doubt by Col. iv 10,' where St. Paul gives the relationship between Mark and Barnabas, and yet hints that the Colossians might be shy of the man who had formerly left Barnabas and Paul at Perga and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xiii 13). The various traditions which assign the foundation of the Church of Alexandria to St. Mark are thought worthy of credit. The statement of Eusebius that Mark's successor at Alexandria was appointed in the eighth year of Nero (A.D. 61–2) explains part of the long interval between Mark's departure from St. Paul at Perga and his being his συνεργός at Rome (Col. iv 11, Philem. 24). The ὁ υἱός μου of 1 Pet. v 13 is not interpreted of any spiritual relationship, which St. Paul at any rate commonly expresses by τέκνον (1 Cor. iv 17; Phil. ii 22; Philem. 10; 1 Tim. i 2, 18; 2 Tim. i 2, ii 1; Tit. i 4), but as 'the affectionate designation of a former pupil, . . . who had come to look upon his mother's old friend and teacher as a second father.' That 'Babylon' means Rome is firmly retained in spite of the recent efforts of Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 27). If the statement of Dionysius of Corinth that Peter and Paul ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον does not compel us to believe—as it certainly does not—that the two Apostles suffered death together, then we ought probably to place the martyrdom of St. Peter after that of St. Paul; and during this interval, say till A.D. 70, we may place Mark's ministering to St. Peter at Rome. That one part of this ministry was acting as the Apostle's 'interpreter,' need not be doubted.

If Peter could speak Greek at all, he 'could scarcely have possessed sufficient knowledge of the language to address a Roman congregation with success.' The suggestion of Papias and statement of Irenaeus, that Mark wrote after Peter's death, is to be preferred to that of Clement, that Peter approved of Mark's writing. Papias had contemporary evidence, Clement had only tradition, which Origen and Jerome somewhat exaggerate until Peter is made to *dictate* to Mark. John the Presbyter, on whom Papias relies, describes what was written in a way that fits our second Gospel very well: it was Mark's record of what he remembered or collected of Peter's recollections respecting the words and acts of Christ. Tregelles' explanation of ὁ *κολοβοδάκτυλος* (which Hippolytus gives as a designation of Mark), that it means 'malingerer' in the sense of 'deserter,' and refers to his leaving the Apostles at Perga, is not approved by Dr. Swete, who points out that an offensive nickname would not have been accepted at Rome, where Mark was known as a loyal fellow-worker with St. Paul. More probably the epithet points to 'a personal peculiarity which had impressed itself on the memory of the Roman Church.'

In § III some year between the death of St. Peter and the destruction of Jerusalem is adopted as the date of the second Gospel. A desire for a written record of the Apostle's teaching would quickly arise; and the absence of indication of the fall of Jerusalem, combined with 'the freshness of its colouring and simplicity of its teaching,' point to a date earlier than A. D. 70. The contention of Blass (*Philol. of the Gospels*, p. 196), that St. Mark wrote in Aramaic, and that Papias mistook a Greek translation for the original, is dismissed as not worthy of very much consideration. The Greek is Mark's own; and the hypothesis of an earlier Gospel written by him in Aramaic is not required. Mark's Greek (of which a very valuable analysis is given in § IV) is estimated as that of 'a foreigner who spoke Greek with some freedom, but had not been accustomed to employ it for literary purposes.' The Latinisms in it have perhaps been insisted upon too much. The Greek which was current in the Roman Empire freely adopted such things. And they would be likely to be frequent in the language of a professional 'interpreter' who had spent some years in Rome.

As to the sources of the Gospel (§ V), Dr. Swete believes that Mark has added to the teaching of St. Peter a few particulars, such as the martyrdom of the Baptist, the flight of the young man in the garden, one or two explanatory notes (*e.g.* vii 3, 4 and 19 *b*), and the interpretations of Aramaic expressions. All these may be assigned to the Evangelist himself. In chapters xiii, xiv he seems to have made use of previously existing documents. Whether or no the Gospel as he left it has received much revision from another hand is a question reserved for future discussion; but probably the first verse, and certainly the last twelve verses, are no part of the original work. The alternative endings are discussed in § XI, and the conclusion reached is, 'that they [the twelve verses] belong to another work, whether that of Aristion or of some unknown writer of the first century.' 'Unless we entirely misjudge the writer of the second Gospel, the last twelve verses are the work of another mind, trained in another school.'

In the list of commentaries on St. Mark, eleven among those which have appeared in the present century are mentioned, seven of which are English. They are placed in chronological order, and no attempt is made to estimate either their characteristics or their value. It would be a help to students who are beginning a library, and who cannot afford to have many books, if at least an asterisk were put to those commentaries which are considered to be specially useful. Some rather well known commentaries are not mentioned.

A few instances of Dr. Swete's refusal to make concessions to the claims of speculative criticism may be mentioned. He exhibits this refusal in two ways, sometimes by merely ignoring the other view, and sometimes by arguing against it. In the notes on i 10, 11 there is no hint that either the descent of the Spirit like a dove, or the Voice from heaven, are to be regarded as legendary additions to the history of the Baptism. There was an actual vision, primarily for the Christ, in which the Baptist was allowed to share as a witness; 'the Voice was audible or articulate only to those who had "ears to hear"'; and 'the immanence of the Spirit in Jesus was at once the purpose of the Descent and the evidence of His being the Christ.' In discussing the Temptation no attention is paid to the suggestion that St. Mark's account of the matter is the only historical one, and that temptations which really took place much later, and during the ministry, have been 'conflated' by Matthew and Luke with the original narrative. Still less is doubt thrown upon the reality of either Satan or the ministering angels. The imperfect (διηκόνουν) is interpreted of the whole forty days. The notes on i 23–26 assume the reality of demoniacal possession. The phrase to be ἐν πνεύματι most often refers to the Holy Spirit, 'but there is nothing in the formula to forbid its application to evil spirits in their relation to men under their control.' 'An exodus was possible, since the human personality, although overpowered, remained intact, awaiting the Deliverer.' So again on *v.* 34; 'It does not seem as though their knowledge [the demons'] went beyond the fact of His Messiahship.' In the case of the Gerasene demoniac there is no toning down of the narrative; 'The unclean spirits recognize that βασανισμός awaits them' (v 7). 'The sing. is used because the spirits, speaking by the voice of the man, are still regarded as a single *ego*' (*v.* 10). 'The spirits at length dissociate themselves from the man, for they know that their hold over him is at an end, and the plural is consequently used' (*v.* 12). The restoration of Jairus' daughter is regarded as a case of raising the dead, and Christ's words, 'is not dead, but sleepeth,' are interpreted as meaning, 'a death from which there is to be so speedy an awakening can only be regarded as a sleep' (v 39). In the O. T., when a prophet raises the dead, he is alone, but 'our Lord, *knowing the issue* (Jo. xi 41, 42), chooses to work in the presence of witnesses,' but takes only three of the Apostles, so as 'not to invade at such a time the seclusion of the home life.' And the Transfiguration is accepted in the sense in which the Evangelists give it to us. The ὤφθη of ix 4 'does not imply either an illusion or a dream; the three, according to Luke, had been disposed to slumber, but were thoroughly roused by the occurrence and saw everything. How the vision was impressed upon the eyes it is useless to enquire.' It is pointed out that 'knew not what to answer' occurs both in the account of the Transfiguration (ix 6) and in that of the Agony (xiv 40); but it is not suggested that either this or the drowsiness has been transferred from the one occasion to the other. Of the Voice from heaven it is remarked that 'it was the first Voice from heaven which the Apostles had heard.' On the other hand there is no attempt to give to the Transfiguration special significances, which, whether they be true or not, are not marked for us in the Gospels and are beyond our knowledge. Although it is believed that in ch. xiii St. Mark is making use of a document rather than of the teaching of St. Peter, there is no countenance given to the view that we have here a leaf from a Jewish Apocalypse, which has been adapted to the Gospel narrative. 'The very posture in which the Lord delivered His great prophecy was remembered and found a place in the earliest tradition' (xiii 3). And the remarkable parenthesis, 'He that readeth, let him understand,' is thought to take the document on which Mark here depends 'back to days before the first investment of Jerusalem (A. D. 66) when the sign yet needed interpretation' (*v.* 14). In the account of the anointing of Christ's feet the act of Mary at Bethany is expressly distinguished from that of the sinner in the house of Simon the Pharisee. 'Tatian *rightly* limits himself here to Mt. Mc. Jo., placing Lc. vii 36 ff. in another and much earlier connexion;' and 'it is not necessary to regard the reference to Simon in Mt. and Mc. as due to the influence of Lc.'s story' (xiv 3). Similarly, the cleansing of the Temple narrated by the Synoptists is assumed to be distinct from that narrated by St. John. 'The market was within the Precinct, and had already attracted the attention of Jesus at the first Passover of His ministry' (xi 15).

That these results, to which others of the same kind might be added, are the outcome of careful and thorough criticism, and not of timid conservatism or harmonistic prejudice, is shown by instances in which the same sober criticism leads Dr. Swete to the admission that the evangelistic record may have lost historic accuracy before it was written in its present form, that one Gospel is sometimes more accurate than another, and that a statement in one may be inconsistent with a statement in another. And in all such questions as to the trustworthiness of the narrative, the appeal is to reasonable critical methods, not to our own ideas as to what inspiration is likely to effect. One or two instances will illustrate this. In ii 26 the words 'in the time of Abiathar the high priest' conflict with 1 Sam. xxi 1–6, and 'may be an editorial note' which Mark has inserted into Christ's words. 'Mc. suggests, and Mt. seems distinctly to state, that this visit to the synagogue followed immediately after the cornfield incident; Lc. places it on another Sabbath . . . the two traditions if not absolutely inconsistent are clearly distinct' (iii 1). 'Mt. with less probability makes the rebuke precede the stilling of the storm' (iv 40). 'The mention of one demoniac does not exclude the presence of a second, unless it is expressly stated that he was alone: still it indicates either a distinct or a blurred tradition. Mc.'s description is too minute in other respects to permit us to suppose that it is defective here' (v 2). 'Mt. and Lc. exclude even this [the *staff* as well as purse and scrip]—an early exaggeration of the sternness of the command. . . . There seems to be no warrant for distinguishing σανδάλιον and ὑπόδημα. . . . If so, Mc.'s account is again at issue with Mt. and Lc.' (vi 8, 9). Here the concluding 'and Lc.' should be omitted. In the charge to the *Seventy* Luke places a prohibition of ὑποδήματα (x 4): in the charge to the Twelve (ix 3) sandals are not mentioned. 'The tradition in Mt. is strangely different . . . Mc.'s account has the ring of real life' (vi 20). 'Mt. alters the setting of this incident by placing it on or after the arrival; in Mc. the omission is discovered, as it appears, while they are crossing' (viii 14). To Christ's prediction of His second advent 'Mt., interpreting the Lord's words by the conviction which possessed the first generation, prefixes εὐθέως' (xiii 24). See also notes on xi 20, xiv 20, 29. On one of Augustine's attempts at harmonizing Dr. Swete remarks, 'The uncertainty thus imported into the history is surely a worse evil than any doubt that can arise as to the precise accuracy of one of the reports' (ii 18),—a principle which should be laid to heart by those who are willing to accept almost any improbable solution rather than admit a real discrepancy.

There are one or two notes of special interest as indicating Dr. Swete's view respecting the κένωσις. On i 22, ii 10 and iii 14 it is clearly pointed out that Christ's ἐξουσία is delegated to Him from the Father and from Him to the Apostles. The woman with the issue was healed without Christ's knowing *who* had been healed. To those who criticized His question His 'only reply was to look round with a scrutinizing gaze which revealed to Him the individual who had stolen a cure' (v 32). When Christ saw the fig-tree afar off, its condition 'seemed to offer the necessary refreshment. . . . But when the Lord had come up to it, He found that the tree did not fulfil its promise' (xi 12, 13; cf. the note on xiv 37). 'Ps. cx is assigned to David in the title (M. T., LXX.), and the attribution was probably undisputed in the first century, and accepted by our Lord and His Apostles (Acts ii 34) on the authority of the recognised guardians of the canon. . . . His whole argument rests on the hypothesis that the prevalent view was correct' (xii 36). On ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν we have, 'The Lord was overwhelmed with sorrow (see next verse), but His first feeling was one of terrified surprise. Long as He had foreseen the Passion, when it came clearly into view its terrors exceeded His anticipations. His human soul received a new experience—ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν, and the last lesson of obedience began with a sensation of inconceivable awe. With this there came another, that of overpowering mental distress. . . . The Lord's human soul shrank from the Cross, and the fact adds to our sense of the greatness of His sacrifice' (xiv 33, 34).

The Greek text adopted by Dr. Swete is nearly the same as that of WH. In one much discussed place he dissents from it. In vi 22 he unhesitatingly rejects αὐτοῦ for αὐτῆς in τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος. A reading 'which represents the girl as bearing her mother's name and as the daughter of Antipas, can scarcely be anything but an error, even if a primitive one: her name was Salome and she was the grand-niece, not the daughter, of Antipas.' In other cases in which WH. and RV. differ, Dr. Swete agrees with WH.; e. g. i 1, x 24, xiii 33.

There are a few things which might be corrected in the next edition; p. xliii, l. 15, viii 35 should be vii 35; p. cii, l. 28, 'suspicion of their genuineness' should be 'doubt as to their genuineness'; note on iii 28, l. 3, Lc.^{8} should be Lc.^{6}; note on viii 37, last line, iv 28 should be iv 29. On vi 19 it might be worth while to cite the provincialism 'to have it in with' (or 'for') 'a man,' i. e. 'to be on bad terms or have a quarrel with him,' as illustrating ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ.

This notice has reached its full limits, but it gives only a poor idea of the wealth of learning and thoughtful comment to be found in Dr. Swete's volume. Most readers of the Journal probably possess it already. It is hoped that what has been said here will induce some of the minority to become acquainted with it and form a more adequate idea of it for themselves.

A. Plummer.

A GERMAN TRANSLATION OF THE CHURCH HISTORY OF ZACHARIAS RHETOR.

Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, in deutscher Übersetzung herausgegeben von K. AHRENS *und* G. KRÜGER. (Leipzig, Teubner, 1899.)

THIS important historical work, published in Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, vol. iii, in 1870, being for the most part untranslated, has until recently been of little use to historians and theologians. Drs. Krüger and Ahrens have therefore done a great service in publishing a German version, in which the whole work is included except the mythological portions of bks. 1 and 2, the description of Rome in bk. 10, and the epitome of Ptolemy's geography in bk. 12. To this they have added a translation of Zachariah's Life of Isaiah the Monk and the anonymous Life of Theodosius of Jerusalem, which are also contained in the third volume of the *Anecdota*. The task has been divided between the collaborators by Dr. Ahrens providing the translation and Dr. Krüger the introduction and notes. The translation is painstaking and literal, sometimes too much so to be intelligible, while Dr. Krüger, with his profound knowledge of the church history of this period, has given us an exhaustive introduction and admirable illustrative and explanatory notes. A long list of textual emendations is appended, for the most part due to Drs. Hoffmann and Nöldeke; but, though Dr. Nöldeke's readings are said to be mostly derived from the MS, no attempt has been made to obtain a complete collation, which, considering the faulty character of the texts of Land and Mai, must be reckoned a serious blemish on the work. Not only is this the case with the London and Rome MSS, but no collation has been made even of the unedited Berlin MS of the Life of Isaiah. A less excusable omission is that in the letter of Proklos and the patristic citations of Timothy little or no attempt has been made to use the Greek for the correction or explanation of the Syriac, sentences being wrongly divided, presents confounded with preterites, and relatives with conjunctions in a way which a glance at the Greek would have made impossible. More than this, the text has sometimes been emended where the Greek shows it to be correct. Thus at p. *39, l. 27, where the text has ܒܡܥܪܬܐ and the Greek *σπηλαίῳ*, Dr. Hoffmann's ܒܡܥܪܒܐ is adopted, and at 47. 27, where the text has ܪܘܝܐ and the Greek *μεθύουσαν*, Dr. Hoffmann's ܕܘܝܐ is substituted. The system of collaboration also has its inconveniences. Thus at p. xxxiv a chronological inference is based upon an impossible translation; the difficulty which Dr. Krüger finds in his note on 41. 32 is due to the fact that, owing to the scribe having omitted to write ܕܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ in red ink, Dr. Ahrens has failed to notice that it is the heading of a citation[1]; and at 31. 7, Dr. Ahrens, by adopting a conjecture of Dr. Hoffmann, has turned a plain text into nonsense, while Dr. Krüger shows by his note that he sees what the sense must be. Again, at 118. 5, a reference to the passage quoted in the note would have shown that *δημόσιον* has its usual meaning of ‘bath.’

Certain other errors might have been avoided by a more thorough study of the author’s language. Thus at 215. 9, the expression ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܦܘܕܠܐ is difficult, but a comparison with 235. 27 (ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ) shows ‘nach dem Worte des Symbols[2]’ to be an incorrect rendering. Again, at *11. 18 (10. 26 L), a reference to 327. 16 L shows that ܠܒܠܬܐ is right, and must not be changed, with Dr. Hoffmann, to ܠܒܠܐ.

At 76. 8 ff, a reference to the Greek text of the Henotikon (which Dr. Ahrens has consulted), ‘*τὴν ἐκ συμφωνίας δοξολογίαν τε καὶ λατρείαν ἡμῶν ἐπαινοῦντος καὶ ἑτοίμως δεχομένου*,’ shows that ܡܩܒܠ is active, and that a copula must be inserted after it.

At 79. 30, Dr. Ahrens’ difficulty about the monk Romanus vanishes upon observing that there is a ܕ before ܪܘܡܢܘܣ, and the rendering should consequently be ‘monks of (the monasteries of) Romanus and Theodore.’ Theodore is therefore not the Bishop of Antinoe, as Dr. Krüger supposes, but the founder of the well-known monastery at Gaza (cf. p. 131. 23).

At 104. 5 ff, the passage which puzzles Dr. Ahrens is, I think, quite clear if we render ܥܡ correctly. Besides the 400 who were to receive the tribute, a few of the general body also remained. ܘܕܥܡܗܘܢ is therefore ‘and those who were with them,’ and there is no need to omit ܕ with Dr. Hoffmann.

I am wholly unable to understand why Dr. Ahrens at 122. 12, after ‘jene zu verwerfenden Personen,’ adds the amazing explanation, ‘der Trinität.’ The ‘reprobate persons’ are of course the Chalcedonian leaders.

At 133. 33, ܚܕܡܕܡ is surely not ‘etwas,’ which is almost meaningless, but ‘one,’ ‘with it’ being supplied from the previous clause.

At 134. 9, I cannot understand why ܙܟܘܬܐ (victory) is rendered ‘Unschuld,’ whereby the reference to Josh. vii is missed.

At 136. 33, the strange statement that Vitalian had been brought up by Anastasius depends only on Dr. Nöldeke’s emendation ܡܪܒܝ, though surely the MS ܡܪܥܝ, ‘reconciled to,’ makes much better sense.

---

[1] There is another strange case of missing a citation at 54. 9, where Dr. Ahrens finds a difficulty about a passage cited from 2 John.

[2] ܦܘܕܠܐ = Symbol in the technical sense is surely without authority.

Dr. Krüger in his note here states that Vitalian was the emperor's nephew, a fact which is quite new to me, and for which no authority is given.

A yet more extraordinary emendation is found at 141. 3. Here the text has the plain sentence: 'The signature of the three patriarchs . . ., who have written and anathematized the Synod, is not dry (ܝܒܫ).' Dr. Ahrens, however, adopts from Dr. Hoffmann ܢܩܒܠ for ܝܒܫ, and renders 'Wir werden weder die Unterschrift der drei Patriarchen . . . empfangen,' thus making Amantius say the very opposite of what the whole context shows his sentiments to have been. Again, at 213. 7, Dr. Hoffmann's ܚܨܦܘܬܐ is substituted for ܚܨܝܦܘܬܐ, it not being noticed that the passage is a reference to Luke xi 8, where the latter word is found. At 191. 14, Dr. Hoffmann's correction is not only unnecessary, but makes the text ungrammatical.

At 171. 9, I do not know whence Dr. Ahrens gets his rendering 'Einwohner' for ܡܠܒܪܐ. The word is no doubt corrupt, but no emendation is suggested.

The passage 218. 34 ff is difficult, but Dr. Ahrens has made it unnecessarily so by rendering ܕܡܘܬܐ 'Ebenbild.' It is in fact ܡܘܬܐ (death), preceded by ܕ, and the defective ܡܘܬ- must be read ܢܡܘܬ, not ܕܡܘܬ.

A reviewer, especially of a translation, is in a somewhat invidious position, since his task is necessarily almost confined to pointing out faults, which in a long and difficult work like this cannot be avoided by any one. Dr. Ahrens, however, has certainly succeeded in throwing light on many difficult passages; he is at his best in the military chapters, while in the purely theological portions he is least satisfactory. On Dr. Krüger's excellent notes I have few remarks to make. On 46. 2, he seems to be in some confusion as to the two Gregories, apparently supposing Gregory of Nazianzos to be Basil's brother. On 222. 8, this letter of Severus is not that contained in Add. 14,602. To the note on 4. 21 it should be added that the gloss, 'native of the city of King Marcian,' in Cod. Rom. is a misunderstanding of 'bp. of Markianoupolis.' On 256. 16, Joseph was the Nestorian Catholic of that name, whose date in Gregory Abu'l Farag[1] agrees with our text.

The numerous emendations, while often needless or worse, also include many admirable suggestions. For instance, on 338. 13[2], Dr. Hoffmann's ingenious ܐܕܪܡܠܟ actually agrees with what is legible in the MS, wrongly read by Land, and on 260. 4, Dr. Ahrens' ܕܡܟܠܐ (perhaps better ܕܡܟܠܗܘ) at least makes good sense. Plausible also is

---

[1] *H. E.* iii, p. 95 ff. The first Monophysite primate seems to have been appointed in 559 (id. p. 99), and his title was not Catholic but *Mafryono*.

[2] In the case of these readings the references are to Land's text.

ܕܡܠܟܘܬܗ at 313. 24. The MS readings, where they differ from Land's text, are given in the translation by Dr. Hamilton and myself; but a fresh study of the MS in connexion with the emendations given by Dr. Ahrens has revealed some cases which we had omitted, and I therefore take this opportunity of giving a list of such readings, as well as those contained in the parts of bks. 1 and 2, which are translated by Dr. Ahrens, but not by us. 6. 16, the end of the word printed ܡܠܟܘܬܐ is blotted and illegible; 7. 6 ܕܡܠܐܟܝܗ; 7. 21 ܐܡܚܠܐ; 7. 23 ܣܚܒ; 8. 1, there is a mark before ܓܡܝܪܘܬܐ, which may denote an omission; 8. 21 ܘܒܟܦܝܢܐ; 10. 20 ܘܒܒܡܘ; 13. 1 ܡܒܓܪ; 13. 9 ܡܠܡܪ; 14. 23 ܚܪܛܐ - - - - ܐ; 15. 24 ܠܒܘܡܪܝܐ - - - - ܕ; 16. 14 ܘܟܠ ܡ - - ܗ; 16. 17 ܚܪܛܐ; 16. 20 ܡܚܝܘ; 16. 25 ܢܚܠܐ; 17. 2 ܢܚܣܟܬܐ(?); 17. 4 after ܒܡܘܣܬܐ ins. ܘܡܣܟܐ ܕܐܘܟܐ; 17. 8 ܕܡܠܟܗ; id. ܐܬܬܕܡܟ; 17. 10 ܒܟܠ ܐܘܗܪ ܠܟܘ ܟܝ; 17. 13 ܐܬܬܣܝܡ; 17. 16 ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ; id. ܡܘܬ ܦܟ - -; 17. 21 ܠܚܡܪܘ ܕܡܚܘ ܘܠܐ (prob.); 18. 2 ܠܗ - ܗ ܐ - ܘ; 18. 3 ܡܒ - -; 18. 4 ܡܣܟܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܟܗ; 18. 10 ܕܡܪܡܒܘܗ; 84. 9 ܡܒܘܕܢ; 85. 7 ܕܐܡܣܟܢ; 86. 8 ܘܩܝܡܢ ܕܡܪܘܬܐ; 86. 11 app. ܘܡܪܪܘ, but with a point under the first ܪ obliterated; 107. 16 ܘܒܡܒܪ; 111. 4 ܦܘܠܣ; 111. 14 ܢܓܪܐ; 114. 16 ܢܟܦܘ; 118. 13 ܐܘܦܪܡܣ; 118. 25 ܬܘܓܪܬ; 123. 26 ܒܟܡܓܝܐ; 124. 24 ܗܪܛܐ; 126. 11 ܒܡܣܟܪܘܬܐ; 128. 24 ܕܡܪܝܐ; 129. 18 ܥܩܪܝܡ ܥܩܪܝܡ; 138. 21 ܕܢܒܘܠ; 145. 15 ܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ; 147. 1 ܡܩܒܠܐ app. altered to ܡܩܒܠܐ; 153. 4 ܡܣܡܟܢܐ; 158. 22 ܘܡܒܝܘܪ; 161. 20 ܠܟܠܗܘܢ; 168. 17 ܢܐܡܪ; 180. 2 ܬܘܪܓܬܐ; 185. 23 ܘܐܠܗܘܢ; 187. 2 ܕܡܪܐ; 196. 21 ܗܢ altered to ܗܘ; 201. 17 ܡܟܠܡܛܝܣ; 205. 11 ܠܡܓܪܐ; 208. 26 ܢܟܕܝܡ ܘܢܦܫܡ; 209. 7 ܐܬܘ, corr. to ܕܐܬܘ; 212. 13 ܒܛܠ; 213. 2 ܩܛܝܪܐ; 214. 6 ܘܟܣܛܪܐ; 230. 3 ܕܐܪܡܣ; 248. 11 ܘܒܪ ܢܡܣܐ; 256. 17 ܗܘܐ; 257. 25 ܟܠܝܐ; 258. 6 ܕܡܛܟܣܘܢ; 260. 4 ܒܥܠܢܐ; 263. 5 ܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܝܐ; 263. 16 ܡܣܟܢܘܬܗ; 283. 20 ܡܘܕܐ; 288. 5 ܘܡܟܣܘ; 290. 25 ܕܕܡܪܘܬܐ; 296. 3 ܡܣܡܟܟܢܐ; 300. 3 ܡܣܟܣܝܢ; 316. 12 ܘܐܙܠܗ; 325. 20 ܒܟܬܟܒܘ; 326. 6 ܗܦܩܝܢ; 338. 15 ܘܐܬܟܡܒܘ.

E. W. Brooks.

CHRONICLE

NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

It is hard to judge correctly of the permanent value of books as they come out, but I cannot help believing that the first two upon my list are the most useful aids to the study of the Gospels that have appeared for some years.

(1) Gustaf Dalman's *Worte Jesu* was published in 1898 (Hinrichs, Leipzig), but it is not yet sufficiently known in England: indeed it is a matter of regret that it has not yet found an English translator. It is mainly concerned with the original Aramaic of our Lord's sayings, and the senses in which the terms He used were employed in Jewish phraseology. This of course has been worked at before, but often by persons who did not possess the necessary linguistic and critical knowledge. The merit of Dr. Dalman's work rests first of all upon the very long and careful study of Jewish Aramaic literature by which he prepared himself for his main task: his *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* is too well known to need praise here. But besides this, the method pursued in the *Worte Jesu* appears to me much more satisfactory than that usually employed. Dr. Dalman does not attempt to translate the Gospels, or even the sayings of Christ, into Aramaic. Those who have tried to do this are fatally hampered by questions connected with the literary style of the several Evangelists: if St. Mark can paraphrase *Talithi cumi* by 'Damsel, I say unto thee, arise,' we are not likely to be successful in hitting upon the exact Aramaic equivalents which correspond to any given saying. Instead therefore of taking the sayings one by one as they stand, Dr. Dalman has busied himself with the retranslation of the phrases which express the *leading ideas* of the Gospel, such *wichtige Begriffe* as 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' 'Eternal Life,' 'the Son of Man,' and all the various names for God and for the Messiah. Round names and expressions such as these, and not in any continuous argument, is grouped the thought of primitive Christianity: an accurate knowledge of the contemporary Jewish use of these terms goes far towards putting the student into the position of those to whom the Gospel was first preached.

It cannot be said that Dr. Dalman is always successful in his contentions; especially doubtful are parts of the long dissertation upon the meaning and original form of the title 'the Son of Man' (pp. 191–219), concerning which Professor A. A. Bevan's article in the *Critical Review* for April, 1899, pp. 140–150, should be consulted[1]. On the other hand the articles upon ὁ εὐλογητός, ἡ δύναμις, ὁ ἅγιος (pp. 163–167), and on *Amen* (p. 185 ff), may be singled out as particularly admirable.

(2) *Horae Synopticae*, by the Rev. Sir J. C. Hawkins (Clarendon Press, 1899), puts into the hand of the student in a singularly clear and attractive form what the author (p. 177) modestly calls 'a collection of materials.' But in the case of a complicated literary problem, such as the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels, the adequate presentation of the facts is essential. Sir John Hawkins tabulates the peculiarities of the three Gospels and discusses their agreements and differences. But what especially distinguishes *Horae Synopticae* is the intelligent manner in which the literary procedure of the several Evangelists is looked at: it is not assumed when St. Matthew ceases verbally to agree with St. Mark that the difference was always due to the use of a fresh 'source.'

The main results to which Sir John Hawkins comes are (i) that our St. Mark, and not an *Ur-Marcus*, was the main source used by the First and Third Evangelists for the framework of their Gospels: the sections of Mt. and Lc. which are peculiar to themselves show a literary style of their own different from the main stock, while on the other hand the peculiarities of Mc. are also the peculiarities of the main stock. But (ii) by the same argument we learn that the author of the 'We'-sections in the Acts was also the compiler of the Third Gospel and the Book of Acts: 'Is it not,' says Sir John Hawkins (p. 150), 'utterly improbable that the language of the original writer of the "We"-sections should have chanced to have so very many more correspondences with the language of the subsequent compiler [of the Third Gospel] than with that of Matthew or Mark[2]?'

(3) Mr. H. S. Cronin's *Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus*, better known as cod. N of the Gospels (Texts and Studies, v 4), is an edition of the 182 newly found leaves of that famous MS, together with the 45 previously known and the variants of the sister codex Rossanensis (Σ).

---

[1] On p. 118, line 9, in the discussion upon ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (Lc. xvii 21), there is a misprint: the Peshitta has לגו מנכון, not בינתכון as in *S* and *C*.

[2] The table on p. 174 of remarkable agreements between Mt. and Lc. not shared by Mc. contains several numbers which are somewhat doubtful on textual grounds (e. g. Nos. [2], 3, 9). Moreover, all our knowledge of the Second Gospel goes back to a copy which was mutilated at the end, and may therefore have had some other faults.

Mr. Cronin has prefaced his edition by a very careful introduction, in which he traces the history of the MS as far as it is possible to do so, and examines its textual character[1]. The chief value of N and Σ to the textual critic is that they appear to represent the text of the Gospels most in vogue at Constantinople in the age of Justinian, just as the fragments of Z and R give that current in Egypt about the same time.

(4) Mr. P. M. Barnard's *Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria* (Texts and Studies, v 5) is a collection of Clement's quotations from the Gospels and the Acts. The text of all the quotations has been verified in the various single MSS upon which our knowledge of Clement ultimately depends, and the necessary corrections and additions to Tischendorf's apparatus pointed out. The general result is that Clement, our oldest witness from Alexandria, used in the Gospels a 'Western' text, akin to D and the Latins rather than to the Old Syriac. In the Acts, on the other hand, the 'Western' element is not so marked. Clement was in any case a bad quoter from the point of view of those who wish to reconstruct his Bible.

(5) Freiherr von der Goltz's *Eine textkritische Arbeit des* 10^{ten} *bezw.* 6^{ten} *Jahrhunderts* (Texte und Unters. N. F. ii 4, 1899) is an account of the MS numbered 184 B 64 at the Laura on Mount Athos. It is a tenth-century minuscule originally containing the whole N. T. except the Gospels, but the Apocalypse is now missing. What gives the MS its exceptional value is that it appears to be the best surviving copy of a recension of the Pauline Epistles independent of the Euthalian edition, in fact a recension which actually claims to have been corrected to or copied from the text as given in Origen's commentaries[2].

This discovery opens out many interesting questions. In the first place, it explains the process by which certain cursives, of which the best known are 47 and the margin of 67 (i. e. 67**), come by their good and rare readings; for these MSS also belong to the same recension as *Athous Laurae* 184 B 64, so that the commentaries of Origen are the ultimate source of their peculiarities[3]. But even more important is the light which it seems to throw upon the process by which the old unrevised κοινη of the N. T. dropped out. Dr. Hort (*Introd.* § 193) speaks of the sudden collapse of the Western text after Eusebius as a 'most remarkable fact': it is somewhat less incomprehensible if the texts issued from the most famous of Christian libraries were based not upon their oldest MSS, but upon the authority of Origen.

---

[1] In an appendix he gives a much-needed recollation of the text of 2^{pe} in St. Mark.

[2] See the subscription to the Pauline Epp. given by von der Goltz, pp. 7, 8. The commentaries of Origen, like those of Lightfoot and St. Augustine, consisted of text and notes: it must have been fairly easy to copy out the Biblical text alone, especially if in their original form a full quotation was given at the beginning of each tome, as is still the case in Orig. *in Joh.* tom. x *init.*

[3] Among the readings thus attested are the omission of ἐν ’Εφέσῳ in Eph. i 1, and the variant χωρὶς θεοῦ for χάριτι θεοῦ in Heb. ii 9.

Before leaving this subject I should like to point out that the remains of a somewhat similar critical work is found in cod. 2^{pe} (Greg. 565) of the Gospels, as may be seen from the facsimile given in Belsheim's edition, but in this instance the connexion seems to be with Jerusalem, not Caesarea. Moreover the textual character of the several members of the group which has the colophons found in 2^{pe} is so diverse, that the problem of how that valuable ninth-century minuscule came to preserve its remarkable and ancient text of St. Mark remains unsolved.

(6) Dr. P. Corssen's *Bericht über die lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen*, a 'Sonderabdruck' from the *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* for 1899 (ii), is the most convenient and up-to-date general account of the Latin versions of the Old and New Testament that has yet appeared. The author begins by frankly confessing that he is giving his personal views, and not a colourless array of other people's opinions, but Dr. Corssen's readers will not quarrel with him on this account. Among the few points upon which he fails to carry conviction with the present writer is his objection to the orthographical variants in 'Wordsworth and White' (p. 71): surely it is a practical convenience to possess these variants in the apparatus to the Latin Bible, because (among other reasons) it is so easy to hunt up all the spellings of a particular word with the help of a concordance.

On pp. 8–15 the reader will find an interesting discussion upon the beginnings of the Latin version. Dr. Corssen is inclined to carry back the earliest Latin translations into the second century, but, as he says, 'Auf festen Boden gelangen wir, wenn wir uns zu Cyprian wenden.' I cannot disguise from myself the fact that I am becoming less and less convinced of the existence of a Latin version before the days of St. Cyprian. The strongest single argument, viz. the occurrence of the phrase ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ χριστοῦ in the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons[1], proves indeed that the letter was written originally in Latin, and that the Greek translator (? Eusebius) sometimes missed the Scriptural allusions; but it is another matter to assume the use of a formal Latin version. Those who are inclined to deny the existence of the Latin Bible before the middle of the third century do not suppose that Latin Christians were altogether ignorant of the Scriptures, but that they were translated orally as occasion arose, much as the Armenian Churches used Syriac for very many years, and as seems to have been done in Palestine in the time of Eusebius.

---

[1] First pointed out by Canon Armitage Robinson in his edition of *Perpetua and Felicitas* (Corssen, p. 11).

On this subject (7) Haussleiter's three articles in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for April 6, 13, and 20, 1900, called *Zwanzig Predigten Novatians*, may well be consulted. Dr. Haussleiter, as the title shows, has accepted Carl Weyman's theory that the newly found *Tractatus Origenis* published by P. Batiffol are really homilies by Novatian himself. He further is inclined to believe that even in Novatian's time no Latin version of the Bible was current in the Roman Church.

F. C. B.

HAGIOGRAPHICA.

Vol. xviii of the *Analecta Bollandiana* (1899) contains the following texts:—*Miracula beati Francisci*, by Thomas de Celano, with an elaborate critical introduction: it is yet another of the primitive Franciscan documents brought to light in our day (pp. 81–176). *Acta graeca SS. Davidis, Symeonis, et Georgii Mytilenae in Insula Lesbo* (saec. viii–ix; pp. 209–59). *Vita venerabilis Lukardis monialis ordinis Cisterciensis in Superiore Wimaria* (pp. 305–67).

Besides the texts there are a number of discussions, historical, critical, polemical, the most considerable being that on *Saints d'Istrie et de Dalmatie* (pp. 369–411); it is for the most part a *résumé* of the hagiographical results of excavations at Salona and Parenzo. There is also a study on the Author and Sources of the Passion of SS. Gorgonius and Dorotheus (pp. 1–21). Among the lesser notes those of most general interest are a page of textual emendations in the Acts of Apollonios, by Max Bonnet (p. 50); and an attempt to determine exactly St. Jerome's birthplace (p. 260).

The *Bulletin des Publications hagiographiques* is one of the most useful features of the *Analecta Bollandiana*; in it new books and articles touching on hagiographical subjects, in the widest sense, are subjected to a frank and sometimes trenchant criticism, works of science, of vulgarization, and of piety being carefully distinguished. The number of works thus dealt with amounted to 228 in the year. The most important appear to be the Ethiopic texts edited by Dr. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles* and the *Lady Meaux MS*; Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis*; Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhomien* (an excellent and thoroughly critical piece of work); Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha*, ii 1; Dürrwächter, *Die Gesta Caroli Magni der Regensburger Schottenlegende*; and Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe* (cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 25).

English hagiology was but poorly represented last year; the only contributions noticed are: a new edition (by Thurston) of Dalgairns' *Life of S. Stephen Harding*; a *Life of St. Edmund of Abingdon*, by Frances de Paravicini; and three or four articles in periodicals, whereof one, *Early Scottish Saints*, by Dom Barrett (*Dublin Review*), is highly spoken of.

Attached to each number of the *Analecta* is an instalment of the *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*, with separate pagination, to form a volume by itself (now complete, pp. 324).

The Bollandists have in hand a still more important catalogue: during the year appeared fasciculi 2 and 3 (pp. 225–687) of their great *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, intended to be a complete catalogue of lives of saints and hagiographical documents of all kinds, written in Latin, up to the sixteenth century. The work when completed will deal with some 8,000 documents, and will extend to 1,200 pages; it has now reached the end of the letter I. During the last ten or twelve years the Bollandists have devoted themselves largely to such work of cataloguing.

Of works not mentioned in the *Analecta* I notice *Acta SS. Confessorum Guriae et Shamonae exarata Syriaca lingua a Theophilo Edesseno anno Christi* 297, edited with a Latin version by Rahmani (the editor of the *Testamentum Domini*); a monograph on St. Bruno, by Löbbel, in the series of *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien* of Knöpfler, Schrörs, and Sdralek; *S. Agnese nella tradizione e nella legenda*, by Franchi, from Herder's *Römische Quartalschrift*, an investigation which leaves little of St. Agnes beyond her personality; *S. Antoine de Padoue: sa vie selon le ms. de son compagnon, Fra Luca*, by Dhanys—if well done (I have not seen it), this ought to be a contribution to early Franciscan history, which is now attracting so much attention. In this connexion it may be worth recording that a controversy is going on concerning the *Speculum Perfectionis*; some good authorities hesitate to accept it for what Sabatier claims it to be, viz. the first 'Legend' of the saint, written by Fra Leone, his favourite disciple. Erbes' *Todestage der Apostel Paulus und Petrus* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*) belongs to the domain of chronology rather than hagiology.

The second volume of Duchesne's *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* has appeared during the year; and alongside of it may be named Savio's *Gli antichi Vescovi d'Italia*, a work akin in scope and spirit, a substantial volume of which, dealing with Northern Italy, is spoken of in the highest terms by the Bollandists. Similar information regarding England, too, has been supplied by Searle's *Anglo-Saxon bishops, kings, and nobles*. Quite recently Hans Achelis has published an important study on the Martyrology—*Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert.*

Finally may be mentioned two groups of articles in the sixth and seventh volumes of Herzog-Hauck's *Realencyklopädie*, chiefly useful on account of their very full bibliographical information. The most considerable is Zöckler's article of 25 pp. on *Franz von Assisi*; Bonwetsch writes on *Gregor der Wunderthäter*, Loofs on *Gregor von Nazianz* and *Gregor von Nyssa*, and Walther on Pope *Gregor I*: it is a surprise to find in such a quarter the Acts of St. Placidus used as a serious historical source (p. 80).

On the whole it may be said that, while some valuable *adminicula* have been contributed to the apparatus of the science, no purely hagiographical work of first importance was produced in 1899.

E. C. Butler.

LITURGICA.

Dr. Rietschl of Leipzig has issued in two fasciculi the first volume of his *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* (Berlin 1899, 1900). After an introduction on the idea, the method, and the form of Liturgics, in the first section he deals with the principles of public worship, with special reference to the Lutheran in contrast with the Catholic conception of it. The second section is historical, and treats first of the apparatus of worship, the architectural development of church buildings, the ornaments both of churches and ministers, and the organization of time in the ecclesiastical year; and then of the history of the Liturgy and its several local developments, down to the present; and of ecclesiastical music. The third section is 'critical and regulative,' and has special reference to practical questions in the Lutheran Church. So far as I can at present judge, it is an excellent manual and none the worse for being written from a definite point of view and with some practical reference. It is lucid and reasonable, learned and full of matter, and serves as a guide to a large mass of literature. The account of the Anglican rite is a distinct improvement on some continental descriptions, and its mistakes are not of importance. It is gratifying to learn (p. 17) that a complete edition of the German *Kirchenordnungen* of the sixteenth century, by Prof. Sehling of Erlangen, is in the press, which, it may be hoped, will supplant Richter's rather irritating work. Dr. Rietschl's second volume is to treat of the 'Occasional Offices.'

The publication of the third volume completes Mgr. Magani's *Antica liturgia romana* (Milan 1897–99). The first volume contains a review of the origin and history of liturgies in general and of their classification, with appendices on the Ambrosian rite, in which Duchesne's view of the origin of the Gallican rite is rejected, and the originally Roman character of the Ambrosian is maintained. The second volume has a short review of the early history of the Canonical Hours, followed by a detailed exposition of the Liturgy. The third volume treats of the accessories of the Liturgy, viz. 'officials,' i.e. the ecclesiastical orders; 'sacred places,' i.e. churches and their ornaments; the sacred vestments; the 'times assigned to the Liturgy,' i.e. the division of the ecclesiastical year; and lastly, 'functions annexed to the Liturgy,' i.e. penance, unction, matrimony, the consecration of virgins, and funeral rites. The work is industrious and covers a good deal of ground; but it seems to be tedious and rather unreadable; and an allusion to S. Firmilian of Caesarea as 'l'ardente Vescovo africano,' 'il povero Vescovo,' is perhaps a straw which shows which way the wind blows.

In *Le Sacramentarium Triplex de Gerbert* (Paris 1900), a reprint of an article in the *Revue des Bibliothèques*, Nov.–Dec. 1899, Dom P. Cagin of Solesmes criticizes in some detail the work of Gerbert in the first volume of *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae*, in which he compared the text of a composite Gelasian, Gregorian, and Ambrosian Sacramentary—the 'codex Sangallensis olim nunc Turicensis'—with the Rheinau and St. Gallen 'Gelasian.' Dom Cagin's criticism is in fact a detailed justification of the summary criticism passed by Mr. Wilson in the Introduction to his edition of the *Gelasian Sacramentary*. The MS of Gerbert's composite Sacramentary has hitherto been searched for in vain. It was supposed with great probability to have been among the MSS carried from St. Gallen to Zürich on the plunder of the Monastery by the forces of Zürich and Bern in 1712; and in Scherrer's catalogue of the St. Gallen MSS in 1875, it was incidentally but mistakenly stated to be the Zürich codex C. 389. Dom Cagin's criticism of Gerbert is only a preface to the announcement that he has at length succeeded in running the MS to ground. Acting on the suggestion of a passing note of his colleague Dom Mocquereau, with some difficulty he identified it in MS C. 43 of the City Library in the Wasserkirche at Zürich.

It is late, but perhaps not too late, to record the appearance of Dr. Julius Smendt's brochure, *Kelchspendung und Kelchversagung in der abendländischen Kirche* (Göttingen 1898). This is a careful study of the history of the withdrawal of the chalice from the assistants, of the use of unconsecrated wine as a *purificatio oris* after Communion, and of allied rites, such as the nuptial cup and eulogiae, especially in German usage. Dr. Smendt does not appear to have noticed that the Abyssinians still 'purify their mouth' with water administered after Communion in both kinds.

It is a pleasure to notice that in the current number of the *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, Juillet 1900) Dom Germain Morin publishes the paper he read before the recent Archaeological Congress in Rome, in which he states with characteristic lucidity and grace and precision the grounds of his brilliant suggestion that the so-called Canons of Hippolytus are to be identified with the Ἐπιστολὴ τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ διακονικὴ διὰ Ἱππολύτου mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi 46 § 5) as among the extant works of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and are therefore not a Roman code at all, but Egyptian. In spite of Dom Morin's modesty, one is tempted to say at once that the mere statement amounts to a demonstration; it at least shifts the *onus probandi*.

The Genius of the Roman Rite (1899) and *Kyrie eleison: a Liturgical Consultation* (1900) are two interesting pamphlets by Mr. Edmund Bishop. The first is a more or less popular exposition of the 'soberness and sense' of the Roman genius as illustrated by the original simplicity of the Roman rite and the contrast between the pure Roman element and the imported Gallican element, which together make up the present composite Roman rite. The second is a careful and learned investigation of the origin of the *Kyrie eleison* and its adoption in the West, which, if not wholly convincing, is illuminating and useful.

The Henry Bradshaw Society issued three volumes in 1899. The *Processional of the Nuns of Chester*, edited by Dr. Wickham Legg, is printed from a MS at Bridgewater House belonging to the Earl of Ellesmere, which seems formerly to have belonged to the Benedictine Nunnery of St. Mary in Chester. Its contents have affinity with the Sarum and York Processionals, with a preference for the former; and in some respects it seems to be eclectic. A feature of the book, which according to Dr. Legg's preface it shares with other Processionals, and especially with Brigittine books, is the presence of vernacular rubrics. Appended is a supplement of English hymns and prayers. Of more importance is the reprint of the *editio princeps* of the *Missale Romanum* of 1474, edited by Dr. Lippe of Aberdeen. This edition, which is mentioned by Brunet, but not in Mr. Weale's *Bibliographia liturgica*, was printed at Milan, and the present reprint is from a copy in the Ambrosiana. A second volume is promised, which is to contain a collation of more than twelve editions of the unreformed missal. Thus we shall possess in a compassable shape the materials for studying in detail the character and extent of the reform of Pius V. *The Coronation Book of Charles V of France*, edited by Mr. Dewick, is a superb edition of a French Coronation Order. The MS, from which it is taken, was written in 1365, very soon after the coronation of Charles V, and added to the Royal Library. On the dispersion of the Library on the death of Charles VI in 1423, the book apparently remained in the hands of the Regent, the Duke of Bedford. It is not heard of again till it appears bound up with an English Pontifical in the collection of Sir R. Cotton, where Selden had access to it, and printed a large part of the text in the second edition of *Titles of Honor* in 1631. It is now with the rest of the Cottonian collection in the British Museum (Tib. B. viii). Mr. Dewick has printed the text of the Coronation Order in two columns, large 4to, with an introduction, copious notes, and reproductions of all the miniatures, representing the successive movements in the coronations of the king and queen, all of them in black and white, and a selection of seven also in colours. The most important section of the Introduction exhibits the curious vicissitudes in the relations between French and English Coronations in their development from the eighth century onwards; thus supplementing Dr. Legg's account of the growth of the English Order in his edition of the Westminster Missal.

The Alcuin Club produced two volumes of 'Collections' in 1899. The first, *English Altars from Illuminated MSS*, edited by Mr. St. John Hope, is a collection of fourteen plates, of which the first twelve contain collotype reproductions of some thirty-four miniatures representing the form and furniture of English altars from the tenth to the fifteenth century, and the last two reproduce the drawings of the high altar and the Islip Chapel in the Abbey of Westminster from Abbot Islip's Obit roll, all with descriptive notes by the editor. It is scarcely necessary to say that in none of them has the altar yet become the mere adjunct and basis of an array of ornaments, such as it has tended to become since the sixteenth century. The second collection, edited by Mr. Frere, consists of collotype reproductions of the miniatures illustrating the Mass in the *Exposition de la Messe*, which is inserted in the legend for Corpus Christi in Jean de Vignay's French translation of the Golden Legend, and contained in the Fitzwilliam Museum MS 22, of about the year 1480. The pictures form a valuable series of illustrations of the ceremonial of the Mass according to the Pre-Tridentine Roman Use. The text of the *Exposition*, an explanation of the prayers of the Mass in part founded on Durandus, is also given, together with four other descriptions of the Mass, viz. that of the *Lay Folks Mass Book*, originally descriptive of the Use of Rouen; an English *Treatise of the Manner and Mede of the Mass*; Lydgate's *Merita missae*; and Becon's *Displaying of the Popish Mass*, of course with the omission of that worthy's profane obscenities.

Three excellent works on the Book of Common Prayer have to be recorded. First, Mr. Maude's *History of the Book of Common Prayer* in the *Oxford Church Text Books* (Rivingtons, 1899). After a chapter on the external history of the Book and its revisions, its several sections are dealt with under the heads of the Liturgy (including the Litany), the Daily Office, the Occasional Offices and the Ordinal, and a further chapter treats of the Scottish Liturgy; and an appendix of Additional Notes gives the familiar passages from Pliny and St. Justin Martyr, a translation of the Sarum Canon, an account of varieties of Eucharistic doctrine, and recommendations of books for further study. The several rites, naturally with especial emphasis on the Liturgy and the Divine Service, are traced back to their ultimate sources, and their development is sketched from the first days onwards. The little book is full and compact, and up to date. Mr. Pullan's *History of the Book of Common Prayer* in the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology* (Longmans, 1900) is on the same lines, but larger in scale; and on this scale it will probably take its place as the best book on its subject. Notably it is lively and readable, which is not always the case with treatises on the Prayer Book. And it is characteristically marked by curious incidental information, e. g. the note on the wedding-ring (p. 222), and the notes on Celtic matters which occur now and again. Appendix D on the Black Rubric is important: Mr. Pullan has discovered, in the library of his own College, proof that the alteration in the wording in 1661 was deliberate, and was intended to alter the sense. There is a careful and very full chronological table, and an index which is also of the nature of a glossary. The third work, the Bishop of Edinburgh's *Workmanship of the Prayer Book* in the *Churchman's Library* (Methuen, 1899), is of a different character. It is a study of the sources of the Prayer Book and their literary treatment in its compilation. Its aim, speaking generally—and this description scarcely exhausts its interest—is to mark the difficulties with which Cranmer was confronted and the skill and subtlety with which they were overcome, to trace the sources of certain characteristics which demand explanation, and to point out certain defects and literary flaws where improvement is possible. The Bishop's suggested improvements, whether in the way of supplement, e. g. by permissive usage, or of literary emendation, will scarcely meet with universal acceptance; but our thanks are due for an interesting and careful and graceful piece of work. In one point he has arrived at a new and important result—which seems to be quite demonstrative, in spite of a certain modesty with which he states it: he has discovered the origin of the last paragraph of the English of the *Media vita*, which has hitherto been a puzzle. He shows it to be the result of successive amplifications, occasioned by literary exigencies, through Luther's paraphrase *Mitten wir im Leben sein* of 1524, and Coverdale's metrical translation of it *In the myddest of our lyvynge* in his *Goostly Psalmes and Spiritual Songs* published some time before 1539. It may be noticed that neither Mr. Maude nor the Bishop of Edinburgh does adequate justice to Cranmer's indebtedness to Luther's Litany of 1529; with Mr. Pullan it is different.

To *Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book historically considered*, edited by Dr. Wickham Legg (Rivingtons, 1899), Mr. Cuthbert Atchley contributes an essay, which so far as available material goes seems to be exhaustive, on the varied ceremonial use of lights in England in 1548. Mr. J. N. Comper contributes a paper on the structure and garniture of the ideal English Gothic sanctuary, from the point of view of an architect and an artist, who of course also recognizes what a church exists for. And Dr. Legg himself adds two essays; one a castigation of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872, and its simple negation of the principles, both explicitly laid down and actually embodied, in the Prayer Book, with further remarks on modern attempts at liturgical composition, and on the frequent indecency of recitation in church: the second on the 'Regalism of the Prayer Book,' distinguishing it from Erastianism, and defending the frequent petitions for the Sovereign in the English Rite on the ground of precedent, ancient and modern. The assimilation of the Order of the Coronation to that of Episcopal Consecration, to which Dr. Legg draws attention, is to be remarked.

F. E. B.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

Church Quarterly Review, April 1900 (Vol. l, No. 99: Spottiswoode & Co.). 'The Testament of our Lord,' Part II—Greek Catenae of the Old Testament—Five Great Oxford Leaders—The Edge of a Parson's Garden—William Makepeace Thackeray—John Donne—Advancing Criticism on the Bible—Ward's 'Naturalism and Agnosticism'—A Typical English Bishop—Evolution and Religion—Dr. St. George Mivart and Continuity—The Life of Archbishop Benson—Short Notices.

Jewish Quarterly Review, April 1900 (Vol. xii, No. 47: Macmillan & Co.). G. H. SKIPWITH The Origins of the Religion of Israel—S. SCHECHTER Some Rabbinic Parallels to the New Testament—B. JACOB A Study in Biblical Exegesis—A. DAVIS and N. DAVIS Ben Asher's Rhymes on the Hebrew Accents—S. SCHECHTER A Further Fragment of Ben Sira—E. N. ADLER Some Missing Chapters of Ben Sira—M. STEINSCHNEIDER An Introduction to the Arabic literature of the Jews, Part II—D. S. MARGOLIOUTH The Sefer Ha-Galuy—A. HARKAVY The Fragment of the Sefer Ha-Galuy—T. K. CHEYNE Note on Sirach l. 9—T. TYLER Ecclesiasticus: The Retranslation Hypothesis.

Expositor, April 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 4: Hodder & Stoughton). D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (3) Unity against Plurality—J. WATSON Doctrines of Grace: The Holy Catholic Church—W. M. RAMSAY Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians (*continued*)—A. BLACK Joseph, an Ethical and Biblical Study: (4) 'The Choice of a Side'—J. RENDEL HARRIS A Further Note on the Names of the Two Robbers in the Gospel—F. C. BURKITT The Thunders of the Lord in Amos—G. W. STEWART Jülicher on the Nature and Purpose of the Parables (*continued*).

May 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 5). D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (3) *continued*, The Unity of Isaiah—J. WATSON Doctrines of Grace: The Holy Catholic Church (*continued*)—J. W. DIGGLE The Nature of Holiness—W. M. RAMSAY Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians: St. Paul on Marriage—A. CARR The First Act of the Apostles, the Election of Matthias—the late J. W. DAWSON The Nature of Christ.

June 1900 (Sixth Series, No. 6). G. G. FINDLAY The Letter of the Corinthian Church to St. Paul—W. M. MACGREGOR Christ's Three Judges: (1) Caiaphas—A. S. LEWIS The Earlier Home of the Sinaitic Palimpsest—D. S. MARGOLIOUTH Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation: (3) *continued*, The Unity of Job—W. C. ALLEN The Original Language of the Gospel according to St. Mark—A. BLACK Joseph, an Ethical and Biblical Study: (5) 'The Life within Bars'—F. C. BURKITT An Additional Note to Amos v 8—G. W. STEWART Jülicher on the Nature and Purpose of the Parables (*concluded*).

(2) AMERICAN.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, April 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 42: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). H. C. MINTON Authority in Religion—B. B. WARFIELD 'The Oracles of God'—J. O. BOYD The composition of the Book of Ezra—T. F. DAY Theological Seminaries and their critics—J. MACPHERSON A Scottish Schoolman of the seventeenth century—G. S. PATTON Paulsen's System of Ethics—B. B. WARFIELD Recent discussions of 'Christian Science'—D. MOORE Zahn's Introduction to the New Testament—J. I. GOOD Recent Studies in Reformed History—Recent Theological Literature.

(3) FRENCH.

Revue Biblique, April 1900 (Vol. ix, No. 2: Paris, V. Lecoffre; for the school of the Dominican convent of St. Stephen of Jerusalem). V. ROSE Études évangéliques: 3 Fils de l'homme et fils de Dieu—M. J. LAGRANGE Débora (Juges: récit en prose, chap. iv; cantique, chap. v)—A. VAN HOONACKER L'auteur du quatrième évangile—Mélanges: H. HYVERNAT Un fragment inédit de la version sahidique du Nouveau Testament, Eph. i 6 – ii 8—P. BATIFFOL Le soi-disant testament de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ—A. CONDAMIN Menus problèmes de critique et d'exégèse: 1 L'unité d'Abdias—E. LEVESQUE Un manuscrit de l'Apocalypse, conservé au séminaire de Saint-Sulpice—M. J. LAGRANGE L'itinéraire des Israélites du pays de Gessen aux bords du Jourdain (*suite*)—Chronique: M. VAN BERCHEM Épitaphe arabe de Jérusalem—H. V. Fouilles anglaises—Recensions—Bulletin.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1900 (Vol. v, No. 1: Paris, A. Picard). TH. MICHAILOVITCH Entre grecs et russes—P. S. VAILHÉ Répertoire alphabétique des monastères de Palestine (*suite*)—L. CLUGNET Vie et

Récits de l'Abbé Daniel de Scété : texte grec—F. Nau Opuscules Maronites : Histoire de Sévère, Patriarche d'Antioche (*suite*)—H. Lammens Voyage au pays des Nosairis (*suite*)—J.-B. Chabot Vie du moine Rabban Youssef Bousnaya (*suite*)—E. Blochet Neuf chapitres du *Songe du viel pelerin* de Philippe de Mézières relatifs à l'Orient (*suite et fin*)—Mélanges : M.-A. Kugener Remarques sur les traductions syriaques des formules grecques Ὁ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς λήξεως et ὁ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης—Bibliographie.

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses, March–April 1900 (Vol. v, No. 2 : Paris, 74 Boulevard Saint-Germain). J. Turmel L'eschatologie à la fin du ive siècle : 1 Eschatologie origéniste—A. Loisy Nouveau témoignage de Jean-Baptiste : Jo. iii 22–36—G. Morin Les nouveaux *Tractatus Origenis* et l'héritage littéraire de l'évêque espagnol Grégoire d'Illiberis—G. Dottin Notes bibliographiques sur l'ancienne littérature chrétienne de l'Irlande : (1) Canons et règles ecclésiastiques et monastiques ; (2) Liturgie ; (3) Martyrologes ; (4) Vies de saints ; (5) Sermons et homélies ; (6) Gloses et commentaires sur la Bible ; (7) Prophéties et visions ; (8) Poèmes religieux—P. Lejay Ancienne philologie chrétienne 1896–1899 : (7) Origène (*suite*) ; (8) Saint Cyprien ; (9) Novatien ; (10) Anciennes traductions de la Bible ; (11) Les trois premiers siècles ; (12) Les empereurs du ive siècle ; (13) Contemporains de la paix de l'Église, Arnobe, Les oracles sibyllins.

May–June 1900 (Vol. v, No. 3). É. Chatelain Fragments palimpsestes d'un lectionnaire mérovingien—J. Turmel L'eschatologie à la fin du ive siècle : 2 La doctrine du salut de tous les chrétiens—J. Gay Les diocèses de Calabre à l'époque byzantine d'après un livre récent—A. Loisy Notes sur la Genèse : (7) Ismael (Gen. xvi, xvii 25–26, xxi 1–20, xxv 7–9, 12–17)—H.-M. Hemmer Chronique d'histoire de l'Église gallicane—P. Lejay Ancienne philologie chrétienne 1896–1899 ; (13) Contemporains de la paix de l'Église (*suite*), Lactance, Eusèbe ; (14) Fondation et organisation des églises.

Analecta Bollandiana, March 1900 (Vol. xix, No. 1 : Brussels, 14 Rue des Ursulines). Les deux saints Babylas—F. Nau Les Martyres de S. Léonce de Tripoli et de S. Pierre d'Alexandrie d'après les sources syriaques—De Vita prima et miraculis B. Benedicti papae XI auctore Bernardo Guidonis—Vita B. Margaritae virginis de Civitate Castelli, sororis tertii ordinis de Paenitentia Sancti Dominici—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques—Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Barberinianae de Urbe—U. Chevalier Supplementum ad Repertorium Hymnologicum (A–Attollat).

June 1900 (Vol. xix, No. 2). Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Barberinianae de Urbe—La légende

de S. François d'Assise dite *Legenda trium sociorum*—De miraculis S. Autberti Cameracensis episcopi libelli duo saec. xi et xii—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques—U. CHEVALIER Supplementum ad Repertorium Hymnologicum (Attolle-Ave salutata).

(4) GERMAN.

Theologische Quartalschrift, 1900 (Vol. lxxxii, No. 3: Ravensburg, H. Kitz). SCHANZ Autorität und Wissenschaft—SCHULZ Zur Sion-Frage—SEYDL Zur Strophik von Jesaia xii—LAUCHERT Die Gregorius Thaumaturgus zugeschriebenen zwölf Kapitel über den Glauben, nach ihren litterarischen Beziehungen betrachtet—MERKLE Cassian kein Syrer—Reviews—Analecta.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, May 1900 (Vol. x, No. 3: Tübingen, &c., J. C. B. Mohr). SCHUELER Die Vorstellung von der Seele bei Plotin und bei Origenes—NIEBERGALL Christentum und Theosophie.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1900, No. 3 (Gotha: F. A. Perthes). LEY Charakteristik der drei Freunde Hiobs und der Wandlungen in Hiobs religiösen Anschauungen—RYSSEL Die neuen hebräischen Fragmente des Buches Jesus Sirach und ihre Herkunft—RIETSCHEL Luthers Anschauung von der Unsichtbarkeit und Sichtbarkeit der Kirche—Notes: TRAUB Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Rechtfertigungsbegriffs—Reviews: DREWS Rietschel's Lehrbuch der Liturgik.

Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, June 1900 (Vol. xliii, No. 2: Leipzig, O. R. Reisland). G. LOEV Das synchronistische System der Königsbücher—A. HILGENFELD Noch einmal die Essäer—C. HOLSTEN Die Ergebnisse der historischen Kritik am neutestamentlichen Kanon—G. LINDER Die Allegorie in Gal. iv 21–31—J. DRAESEKE Zu Apollinarios' von Laodicea 'Ermunterungsschrift an die Hellenen'—J. DRAESEKE Johannes Phurnes bei Bekkos—A. HILGENFELD F. Loofs gegen E. Haeckel—H. P. CHAJES Barabbas—F. GOERRES Beiträge zur Geschichte der Cistercienser-Abtei Himmerod—Reviews.

Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, March 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 3: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). TH. KOLDE Ueber die Sektenbewegung im 10. Jahrhundert und ihre Bedeutung für die Kirche—J. BOEHMER Theologie und Laien—V. SCHULTZE Ein unbekanntes lutherisches Konfirmationsbekenntnis aus dem Jahre 1529—J. DRAESEKE Zu Anselms *Monologion* und *Proslogion*.

April 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 4). L. H. IHMELS Wie werden wir der christlichen Wahrheit gewiss?—J. BOEHMER Theologie und Laien (*Schluss*)—F. LUTHER Christliche Freiheit und Pelagianismus.

May 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 5). Th. Zahn Neue Funde aus der alten Kirche—F. Buettner Zinzendorfs Verdienste um die Theologie —F. Luther Christliche Freiheit und Pelagianismus (*Fortsetzung*)—E. C. Achelis Bemerkungen zu dem Waldeckschen Konfirmationsbekenntnis aus dem Jahre 1529—P. Tschackert Zur Datierung von Luthers Geburtstag.

June 1900 (Vol. xi, No. 6.) Th. Zahn Neue Funde aus der alten Kirche (*Schluss*)—F. Luther Christliche Freiheit und Pelagianismus—Th. Kolde Edward Irving, ein biographischer Essay—P. Ewald 'Darum soll das Weib eine Macht auf dem Haupte haben um der Engel willen.'

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums (Vol. i, No. 1: Giessen, A. Töpelmann). E. Preuschen Idee oder Methode?—Ad. Harnack Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes — P. Wernle Altchristliche Apologetik im Neuen Testament—W. Wrede Miscellen: 1 Μετάνοια Sinnesänderung: 2 Τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης: 3 Harnacks Hypothese über die Adresse des 1. Petrusbriefes—E. Preuschen Σύνσωμος Eph. iii 6.

May 1900 (Vol. i, No. 2). H. Achelis Spuren des Urchristentums auf den griechischen Inseln?—U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Ein Bruchstück aus der Schrift des Porphyrius gegen die Christen—E. Preuschen Die armenische Uebersetzung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen—W. Bousset Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen—E. Nestle Miscellen: (1) Ein wichtiges Citat der Didascalia: (2) War der Verfasser des ersten Clemens-Briefes semitischer Abstammung?—E. Preuschen Das Rätselwort im Spiegel 1 Cor. iii 12 —Bibliographie.

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, April 1900 (Vol. xxi, No. 1: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). Gruetzmacher Die Abfassungszeit der *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* des Hieronymus—Ficker Zur Würdigung der *Vita Fulgentii*—Priebatsch Staat und Kirche in der Mark Brandenburg am Ende des Mittelalters (*Schluss*)—Baur Zur Vorgeschichte der Disputation von Baden (1526)—Friedensburg Zur Geschichte des Wormser Konvents 1541—Analecta: Burn Neue Texte zur Geschichte des apostolischen Symbols—Tschackert Daniel Greisers Bericht über die von ihm gehörte Predigt Luthers zu Erfurt am 7. April 1521—Berbig Luther-Urkunden aus Coburg und Gotha.

END OF VOL. I

V-22
151

DATE DUE

MAR 10 1996
MAR 7 1996

GAYLORD
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
3 2400 00307 2158

v.1
1899/1900
13615
Journal
of
Theological
Studies
THREE DAY